

# Gregory Nazianzen's Anastasia Church: Arianism, the Goths, and Hagiography

ROCHELLE SNEE

It is curious to read in the *Vita Marciani* that the Arian Gothic-Alan generals Ardabur (junior) and Aspar provided the ecclesiastical vessels (πλείστα καὶ ἄξιοθέατα [πολυτε]λῇ σκεύῃ) for Marcian's purported rebuilding of Gregory Nazianzen's Anastasia church (ἐν τοῖς Δομνίνου ἐμβόλοις).<sup>1</sup> Marcian, priest and *oikonomos* of Hagia Sophia (ca. 450–472), in thanks for this generosity, had the Gospels read in Gothic in the Anastasia on festal days. Nazianzen, and to a lesser extent his Constantinopolitan church, remained throughout the Byzantine period a potent symbol of (Nicene) orthodoxy. The *Vita Marciani*, written by a near contemporary, is evidence for this in the late fifth century: Marcian's rebuilding of the Anastasia is said to have been inspired by a prophecy in Gregory's writings;<sup>2</sup> several miracles at the Anastasia are explicitly interpreted as anti-Arian. How then are we to assess the Arian generals' interest in the church? When was this donative made, and what was its significance?

The question of the survival of Arianism in the East, after its condemnation at the Council of Constantinople in 381, has received little attention.<sup>3</sup> This is partly because the

<sup>1</sup>*Vita Marciani*, ed. M. Gedeon, Βυζαντινὸν ἑορτολόγιον (Constantinople, 1899), 277 (92B2). Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 188r, col. 2, reads πολυτελῇ τε σκεύῃ. For the Life of Marcian: *BHG* 1032–34b, and *BHG Auct* 1034b; the Metaphrastic *vita*: PG 114:429–56 = *AASS*, Jan. 1:611–19 (*sic*); in the *Synaxarium CP*, 379–80, Marcian's feast day is Jan. 9, elsewhere Jan. 10; on the manuscript, see note 75, below. The *Vita Marciani* is not cited in *PLRE*, II, 135–37 (Ardabur Junior 1) or 164–69 (Fl. Ardabur Aspar). Most recently, see H. Saradi, "Notes on the *Vita* of Saint Markianos," *BSI* 56 (1996), 18–25. (I am grateful to A.-M. Talbot for this and two other references.) On the Anastasia: R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*, I: *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique*, 3, *Les églises et les monastères*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1969), 22–25, and idem, "Études de topographie byzantine: Ἐμβολοὶ τοῦ Δομνίνου. Τὰ Μαυριανοῦ," *EO* 36 (1937), 137–49; J. Ebersolt, *Sanctuaires de Byzance* (Paris, 1921), 90–91; G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale* (Paris, 1974), 447–49. L. Rydén, "A Note on Some References to the Church of St. Anastasia in Constantinople in the 10th Century," *Byzantion* 44 (1974), 198–201, argues that Janin's (*Églises*, 25) Anastasia churches 3 and 4 are identical with Anastasia 2, Nazianzen's church. See also G. P. Majeska, *Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, DOS 19 (Washington, D.C., 1984), 289, and cf. 44, 150, 336–37; *Dumbarton Oaks Bibliographies*, I.1:246; A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos* (Bonn, 1988), 444–47, 515–16.

<sup>2</sup>Sergius, *Vita Marciani*, 5, ed. Gedeon, 273–74; A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας, IV (St. Petersburg, 1897), 260–61 [hereafter ed. P.-Ker.]; cf. the Metaphrastic *vita*, PG 114:436A–C.

<sup>3</sup>The fullest modern study only goes through the 4th century: M. Simonetti, *La crisi ariana del IV secolo*, *Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum"* 11 (Rome, 1975); K. D. Schmidt, *Die Bekehrung der Ostgermanen zum Christentum (Der ostgermanische Arianismus)* (Göttingen, 1939). It is disappointing that there is only very sum-

sources stem from a period of Nicene ascendancy and propaganda;<sup>4</sup> it is also because, with the important exception of the Goths, the Arian party, splintered by internal division and deprived of imperial support, gradually lost its constituency. The rapidity of its demise, however, is too often exaggerated;<sup>5</sup> and, at the same time, the effect of Gothic Arianism on the fate of the sect in general has not been sufficiently taken into account. Some aspects of the hagiographical evidence for Constantinople on these issues will be discussed later.

First, we must look at the history of Nazianzen's Anastasia church. R. Janin has discredited Marcian's rebuilding, and the general historical value of the *Vita Marciani* is not above reproach.<sup>6</sup> But A. Demandt's article, "Der Kelch von Ardabur und Anthusa," makes the vessels (σκεύη) of Ardabur and Aspar at least appear fact, not fiction.<sup>7</sup>

An analysis of the *Vita Marciani* is clearly called for. This is particularly the case since scholars have not adequately differentiated the three extant versions of the Life (the Metaphrastic and two pre-Metaphrastic *vitae*), nor are existing editions based on sufficient manuscript evidence.<sup>8</sup> My comments should contribute to establishing the text and provide a more secure basis for interpretation. Moreover, Marcian is an odd hero for early hagiography, which is usually peopled with stylites, hermits, and monks, not wealthy aristocratic *oikonomoi*.<sup>9</sup> His *vita*, as we shall see, served specific propagandist functions in fifth-century Constantinople.

## I. THE ANASTASIA

In origin, the Anastasia was a house chapel, given the name Anastasia by Nazianzen to symbolize his resurrection (*anastasis*) of the Nicene faith (379–381) in the Arian-dominated capital.<sup>10</sup> Interestingly, this double entendre was not forgotten, and Gregory

---

mary treatment of Arianism in G. Albert, *Goten in Konstantinopel: Untersuchungen zur oströmischen Geschichte um das Jahr 400 n. Chr.* (Munich, 1984).

<sup>4</sup>See R. Snee, "Valens' Recall of the Nicene Exiles and Anti-Arian Propaganda," *GRBS* 26 (1985), 395–419. Cf. G. Dagron, "Les moines et la ville: Le monachisme à Constantinople jusqu'au concile de Chalcédoine (451)," *TM* 4 (1970), 229–76 (on the Macedonian origin of monasticism at Constantinople); T. S. Miller, *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire* (Baltimore, Md., 1985), 68–88 (on the possible Arian origin of the hospital).

<sup>5</sup>An exception, W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia, 1984), 755 (briefly). Theodoret of Cyrrhus, in the mid-5th century, converted an Arian (Homoian) and a Eunomian village, *Epp.* 81, 113, 116: PG 83:1260CD, 1322B, 1324CD.

<sup>6</sup>Janin, *Églises*, 22–23, and idem, "Études de topographie," 138–39; Dagron, *Naissance*, 512 n. 5.

<sup>7</sup>*DOP* 40 (1986), 111–17. See most recently R. Scharf, "Der Kelch des Ardabur und der Anthusa," *Byzantion* 63 (1993), 213–23.

<sup>8</sup>Janin, though he cites all the various Lives of Marcian (*Églises*, 22 n. 9; "Études de topographie," 138 n. 7), relies on the Metaphrast, the most comprehensive of the current editions. Dagron (e.g., *Naissance*, 495 nn. 2 and 3) uses only the Papadopoulos-Kerameus edition (above, note 2), which is the shorter and later of the two pre-Metaphrastic versions. See below, pp. 166 ff.

<sup>9</sup>The *Vita Marciani* may represent a turning point; cf. E. Patlagean, "Ancient Byzantine Hagiography and Social History," in *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*, ed. S. Wilson (Cambridge, 1983), 102; L. Cracco Ruggini, "Il miracolo nella cultura del tardo impero: Concetto e funzione," in *Hagiographie: Cultures et sociétés, IVe–XIIe siècles* (Paris, 1981), 168–69.

<sup>10</sup>On the name: Janin, *Églises*, 23, and idem, "Études de topographie," 137, 140–41. Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 42.26: PG 36:489B; *Carm.* II.1.5, 3–5: PG 37:1022–23 (*Ad plebem Anastasiae*); II.1.11, 1079–83: ed. C. Jungck (Heidelberg, 1974), 106 (*De vita sua*); I.1.15, 49–50: PG 37:1254A (*De seipso post reditum*); II.1.16, 306,

himself remained intimately linked with the Anastasia, though new associations accrued to the church through the centuries.

For Nazianzen, the Anastasia was primarily a community, not a building.<sup>11</sup> On occasion he calls it a *νόος*, but most frequently refers to it as a tent (*σκηνή*), evoking images of the Israelites wandering in the desert.<sup>12</sup> His one extended reference to the chapel as a building is in a poem entitled “*Somnium de Anastasiae ecclesia*,” written from retirement after he abdicated the see of Constantinople in 381.<sup>13</sup> Gregory envisions his former congregation filling the Anastasia to hear his sermons, and he mentions some architectural details—a chancel screen (line 14), holy doors (line 15), and an implied sanctuary (lines 7–12)—but the bulk of the crowd is apparently in the streets (lines 17–20). Later in the poem (lines 75–76), he longs for his newly built church (*νεόπηκτος νηός*), a possible reference to Nectarius’ (bishop 381–397) rebuilding, but more likely a metaphor for the community, as is the name Anastasia itself.<sup>14</sup>

The house chapel may have existed before Nazianzen’s arrival in the capital early in 379.<sup>15</sup> A small community of Eustathian Nicenes had persisted throughout the period of Arian ascendancy, but had been without a church since the bishopric of Macedonius (350–360) and without a bishop since the abortive attempt to install the shadowy Evagrius in 370.<sup>16</sup>

Nazianzen, in his brief tenure of the Nicene episcopacy of the capital,<sup>17</sup> delivered twenty-two orations, the majority of which were pronounced in the house chapel of the Anastasia (January 379–November 27, 380).<sup>18</sup> These include the famous Five Theological Orations, from which he gained his epithet *ὁ Θεολόγος*.<sup>19</sup> It was as an eloquent and fiery

62: PG 37:1254A, 1258A (*Somnium de Anastasiae ecclesia*). Gregory consistently uses “Anastasia” to refer to his community and reserves “Anastasis” for Christ’s Resurrection (e.g., *Or.* 1.1: PG 35:396A; *Or.* 16.9: PG 35:945C; *Or.* 40.24: PG 36:392B; *Or.* 41.14: PG 36:448A; *Or.* 45.24: PG 36:657A), or resurrection in general (e.g., *Or.* 42.26: PG 36:465B; *Or.* 45.29: PG 36:661D). On the house church: J. G. Davies, *The Origin and Development of Early Christian Architecture* (London, 1952), 20–21.

<sup>11</sup> See, particularly, Greg. Naz. *Carm.* II.1.5, 1–7: PG 37:1022A (*Ad plebem Anastasiae*). The Metaphrast, *Vita Marciani*, chap. 5: PG 114:436A, recognizes and emphasizes this; cf. *Vita Marciani*, ed. Gedeon, 273 (88A1–A2), and ed. P-Ker., 260.

<sup>12</sup> Cf., e.g., *Carm.* II.1.11, 1079: ed. Jungck, 106 (*De vita sua*), and *Or.* 25.19: PG 35:1224C. Ambrose calls it *privatae aedes*, Ep. 13.3: PL 16:991A.

<sup>13</sup> *Carm.* II.1.16: PG 37:1254–61. Dating: L. F. M. de Jonge, *De S. Gregorii Nazianzeni carminibus quae inscribi solent περὶ ἑαυτοῦ* (Amsterdam, 1910), 120.

<sup>14</sup> For *νεόπηκτος* used metaphorically, cf. (of the Trinity) Greg. Naz. *Carm.* II.1.17, 47: PG 37:1265A (*De diversis vitae generibus*); (of virginity) *Carm.* I.2.1, 378: PG 37:550A (*In laudem virginittatis*). For similar architectural detail, cf. *Or.* 42.26: ed. J. Bernardi (SC 384 [Paris, 1992]), 108.

<sup>15</sup> Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4.1 (hereafter Soc. HE): Janin, “Études de topographie,” 137. M. Lenain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire ecclésiastique*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1714), 708 n. 24, however, believed that the chapel was specifically designed for Gregory. So too J. Bernardi, “Nouvelles perspectives sur la famille de Grégoire de Nazianze,” *VChr* 38 (1984), 354–56, though the Anastasia is unlikely to have been a reception hall in an aristocratic mansion; see below.

<sup>16</sup> On the complex ecclesiastical politics of the period, see Dagron, *Naissance*, 419–49. Priests had maintained the Nicenes: e.g., Greg. Naz. *Or.* 23: Gregoire de Nazianze, *Discours* 20–23, ed. J. Mossay, SC 270 (Paris, 1980). Socrates (HE 2.38) says the Nicenes were in communion with the Novatians who had three churches in the city; cf. Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 4.20 (hereafter Soz. HE). But the Novatians themselves were persecuted under Macedonius; see below, p. 170.

<sup>17</sup> P. Gallay, *La Vie de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze* (Paris, 1943), 132–211.

<sup>18</sup> J. Bernardi, *La prédication des pères cappadociens: Le prédicateur et son auditoire* (Marseille, 1968), 140–90.

<sup>19</sup> Orations 27–31: ed. P. Gallay, SC 250 (Paris, 1978).

opponent of Eunomian Arianism that Gregory's reputation, not only as an orator but also as an image of orthodoxy, was assured.<sup>20</sup>

Even after the Council of Constantinople in 381, Arianism, whether in its Homoian or Eunomian form, remained a problem, if not a serious threat, for some time to come.<sup>21</sup> In 388, on rumor of Theodosius I's defeat by the usurper Maximus, Arians in Constantinople burned the house of Bishop Nectarius.<sup>22</sup> John Chrysostom (bp. 398–404) actively proselytized among the Arians.<sup>23</sup> Theodoret of Cyrrhus was proud of his Arian converts;<sup>24</sup> his *Ecclesiastical History*, written between 441 and 449, was even more anti-Arian than those of Socrates and Sozomen.<sup>25</sup> Clearchus, uncle of Emperor Anastasius (491–518), was an Arian.<sup>26</sup> Only in 524 did an edict of Justin I exclude Arians from all civil and military offices.<sup>27</sup> Through the reign of Leo I (457–474), Arian Goths in the army were a force to contend with; under Justinian, and even as late as Tiberius II (698–705), some still served as *foederati*.<sup>28</sup>

Continuing orthodox propaganda was prudent, and Nazianzen and the Anastasia church appear to have been part of this program. In the fifth century, Sozomen (*Historia ecclesiastica* [HE] 7.5.3), for instance, was well aware that the house chapel had been named to commemorate Nazianzen's revival of Nicaea in the capital. Gregory's association with the Anastasia and anti-Arianism was undoubtedly popularized by the *Vita Marcialiani* and is remembered in the sixth century by Marcellinus Comes.<sup>29</sup>

Moreover, the history of the Anastasia building itself would indicate its propagandist function. From Socrates we learn that the chapel, before his day (ca. 440), had had a large church built adjoining it:<sup>30</sup> τότε δὲ Γρηγόριος ὁ Ναζιανζοῦ μετατεθεὶς ἔνδον τῆς πόλεως

<sup>20</sup>See, e.g., L. Brubaker, "Politics, Patronage, and Art in Ninth-Century Byzantium: The *Homilies* of Gregory of Nazianzus (B.N. Gr. 510)," *DOP* 39 (1985), 4–6; C. Walter, *Art and Ritual of the Byzantine Church* (London, 1982), 170–71.

<sup>21</sup>Cf. J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire* (New York, 1958) (hereafter *LRE*), I, 349, 378 (briefly). On Arianism in general, see Simonetti, *La crisi ariana*. Arianism remained the "archetypal experience of heresy" (Walter, *Art and Ritual*, 110). Cf. F. Dvornik, "The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm," *DOP* 7 (1953), 87–89 (Photius' comparison of Arianism and Iconoclasm).

<sup>22</sup>Soc. HE 5.13.

<sup>23</sup>See below, pp. 177–78.

<sup>24</sup>See above, note 5.

<sup>25</sup>G. F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories* (Paris, 1977), 202–3, 237; idem, "The Date of Composition of Theodoret's Church History," *VChr* 35 (1981), 250.

<sup>26</sup>Theodore Anagnostes, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.7 (hereafter Theod. Anagn. HE): PG 86:185C–188A; see also *ibid.*, 2.43, PG 86:205B, for an Arian bishop under Marcian (450–457). George Hamartolus, *Chronicon*, IV.523.16: PG 110:772D, says there was an Arian bishop of Constantinople, Deuterios, under Anastasius.

<sup>27</sup>Theophanes, *Chronographia*, A.M. 6016: ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1883; repr. Hildeheim, 1963), 109. According to H. Wolfram, *History of the Goths* (Berkeley, Calif., 1988), 331, the edict was in retaliation for the execution of Boethius. W. E. Kaegi Jr., "Arianism and the Byzantine Army in Africa, 533–546," *Traditio* 21 (1965), 37, reprinted in idem, *Army, Society and Religion in Byzantium* (London, 1982), no. VII.

<sup>28</sup>Kaegi, "Arianism," 28, and idem, *Byzantine Military Unrest, 471–843* (Amsterdam, 1981), 6–7, 20, 26–27, 75, 82–83, 85.

<sup>29</sup>*Chronicon*, annus 380: PL 51:917C. Rufinus had translated ten of Nazianzen's orations into Latin around 400, and the oldest scholia on the orations probably date to the 5th century; see F. Lefherz, *Studien zu Gregor von Nazianz: Mythologie, Überlieferung, Scholiasten* (Bonn, 1958), 112–13, and E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, II (Leipzig, 1898), 568.

<sup>30</sup>The *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae* (ca. 430), ed. O. Seeck, *Notitia Dignitatum* (Berlin, 1876), 235, locates the Anastasia in the 7th region. For a dating of the *Notitia* to between 423/4 and 427/8, see P. Speck, "Der Mauerbau in 60 Tagen," in *Studien zur Frühgeschichte Konstantinopels*, ed. H. G. Beck (Munich, 1973), 144–50.



ἐν μικρῷ εὐκτηρίῳ τὰς συναγωγὰς ἐποιεῖτο· ὅτι νῦν ὕστερον οἱ Βασιλεῖς μέγιστον οἶκον εὐκτήριον προσσυναψάντες, Ἀναστασίαν ὠνόμασαν (*HE* 5.7; cf. *Soz. HE* 7.5.2). ("At that time Gregory Nazianzen, having been translated to Constantinople, was holding his assemblies within the city in a small chapel, to which at a later time the emperors adjoined a very large church and named it Anastasia.") The significance of this passage has, in general, been overlooked.<sup>31</sup> As we shall see, the *Vita Marciiani* makes it explicit that the chapel was not replaced, but remained as an annex to the new Anastasia.<sup>32</sup>

Socrates does not name the emperors who were responsible for building the new church, but we know from Photius that one of the charges against Chrysostom at the Council of the Oak (403) was that he had sold off the marble Nectarius had stored up for facing the Anastasia.<sup>33</sup> The church was therefore built during the reign of Theodosius I and had not yet been fully decorated by the reign of Arcadius. The Theodosian building was undoubtedly part of a propaganda campaign during the transformation of the capital from Arian to Nicene domination.<sup>34</sup> Its unfinished state in 403 would suggest a construction date later in Theodosius' reign, probably in response to the Arian riot of 388.

If we leave Marcian's purported rebuilding aside, the next known event in the history of the Anastasia is the translation of the relics of a St. Anastasia from Sirmium.<sup>35</sup> Theodore Anagnostes (530) states that these relics were deposited in the church during the reign of Leo I (457–474) and the patriarchate of Gennadius (458–471).<sup>36</sup> On this evidence the translation dates to sometime between 458 and 471.

It is unclear on what basis Janin narrows the date for the arrival of St. Anastasia's relics to 468–470.<sup>37</sup> Later sources give more precise dates than Theodore, but not those of Janin. Moreover, these accounts are modeled on the Lector's, while their dating varies widely. Theophanes (9th century), for instance, puts the translation in the sixteenth year of Leo's reign;<sup>38</sup> a date of 473 clearly falls outside the parameters set by the sixth-century source. Cedrenus' (11th–12th century) date of the first year of Leo's reign (February 7, 457–February 7, 458) is barely compatible with Theodore's at the other extreme.<sup>39</sup> Eroding our confidence still further is that elsewhere Cedrenus mentions the translation of relics from Nicomedia of a—presumably second—St. Anastasia in the seventeenth year

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Janin, "Études de topographie," 133–34, 137; Dagron, *Naissance*, 448, 5.

<sup>32</sup>To my knowledge, noted only by Berger, *Patria*, 446.

<sup>33</sup>*Bibliotheca*, cod. 59; ed. R. Henry, I (Paris, 1959), 53, grievance 4. On the probable authenticity of the charge, see Dagron, *Naissance*, 498.

<sup>34</sup>Cf. Snee, "Valens' Recall," 407–8.

<sup>35</sup>This is the only historical evidence for St. Anastasia (*BHG* 81–83b). Her feast was celebrated on Dec. 22 in the East and on Dec. 25 in the West, where she was transformed into a Roman noblewoman martyred under Diocletian and became the patron saint of the *titulus Anastasiae* at the foot of the Palatine. See J.-P. Kirsch, "Anastasie (Sainte)," in *DACL* 1.2 (Paris, 1924), 1919–24; H. Delehaye, *Étude sur le Légendier Romain: Les saints de Novembre et de Décembre* (Brussels, 1936), 151–71; Janin, "Études de topographie," 146; R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie* (Poitiers, 1953), 281. An apparent fictional doublet of Anastasia was revered on various days in October (*BHG* 76x–78e); see H. Delehaye, "La Passion de Sainte Anastasie la Romaine," *Mélanges d'hagiographie grecque et latine*, SubsHag 42 (Brussels, 1966), 394–402, reprinted from *Studi dedicati alla memoria di Paolo Ubaldo* (Milan, 1937), 17–26; P. Devos, "Sainte Anastasie la vierge et la source de sa passion," *AB* 80 (1962), 33–51.

<sup>36</sup>*HE* 2.65; PG 86.1:216AB; cf. H. G. Opitz in *RE* 5A<sup>2</sup> (1872–75), 1880.

<sup>37</sup>*Églises*, 27; cf. "Études de topographie," 140, where he dates the translation to 458–460!

<sup>38</sup>*Chronographia*, ed. de Boor, 111.

<sup>39</sup>*Historiarum Compendium*, PG 121:661C.

of Leo's reign.<sup>40</sup> We clearly need more reliable and contemporary evidence if we hope to have a firmer date for the *depositio* of the saint in the Anastasia church.

Naturally, with the introduction of the relics of St. Anastasia, confusion arose about the significance of the name of the church.<sup>41</sup> (ἡ) (ἀγία) Ἀναστασία, from the later fifth century on, more frequently refers to the saint, not to Nazianzen's abstraction, but the latter was never lost from view. Cedrenus, in a discussion ultimately derivative from Sozomen, records that one meaning of the name Anastasia was "the resurrection of true religion";<sup>42</sup> and, in the twelfth century, Zonaras can still depict Nazianzen boldly teaching orthodox Trinitarian doctrine at the church.<sup>43</sup> This, in spite of the fact that on occasion the church was also thought to commemorate the Anastasis, that is, Christ's Resurrection, and was sometimes so called.<sup>44</sup>

Variant names for a church were a common phenomenon in Byzantium and could either be without significance or reflect coexisting associations.<sup>45</sup> As early as Sozomen, the name Anastasia was also thought to commemorate the death and resurrection of a woman congregant in the church. This story, as noted below, was repeated through the centuries and may have given rise to the church's popularity as a healing shrine, which was well established by the tenth century.<sup>46</sup>

Memory of Nazianzen's association with the Anastasia was reinforced, at least from the ninth century on, through the incorporation of certain of his orations in the liturgy: Oration 42, in which Gregory himself explains the name (PG 36:489B), was read on his feast day.<sup>47</sup>

A church's festivals and its role in imperial ceremonial contribute greatly to our understanding of its significance. The two prominent feasts celebrated at the Anastasia were those of St. Anastasia (December 22) and Gregory Nazianzen.<sup>48</sup> January 25 commemo-

<sup>40</sup> PG 121:668B. Janin, "Études de topographie," 142, incorrectly reads and cites this passage; the reign of Leo, *not* that of Zeno, is under discussion. Janin (*ibid.*, 142 and 146) conjectures that these relics could have been deposited in the Anastasia church in the portico of Domninus, but that more likely there were two Anastasia churches in Constantinople at the time of Cedrenus. Cf. above, note 35, on the two Anastasia martyrs and see Majeska, *Russian Travelers*, 289 and n. 2, for multiple relics of St. Anastasia.

<sup>41</sup> See above, note 10.

<sup>42</sup> *Hist. Comp.*, PG 121:600D. Cf. above on Sozomen. Cf. Nicephorus Callistus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 12.7.

<sup>43</sup> *Epitome Historiarum* 13.19: ed. L. Dindorf, III (Leipzig, 1870), 229.

<sup>44</sup> See, e.g., *Hist. Comp.*, PG 121:712A (Holy Anastasis) and 1125B, where the church is referred to as both the "Holy Anastasis" and "St. Anastasia"; Nicetas the Paphlagonian (10th century), *Encomium of Gregory Nazianzen*, chaps. 14–15, ed. J. J. Rizzo, SubsHag 58 (Brussels, 1976), 46–47, has all three associations: the saint, Nazianzen's abstraction, and Christ's Resurrection! On the designation "Anastasis" for the church, and ultimately an adjoining monastery, see Janin, "Études de topographie," 140–41, 143.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. G. Downey, "The Name of the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople," *HTR* 52 (1959), 37–41; Av. Cameron, "Notes on the Sophiae, the Sophianae and the Harbour of Sophia," *Byzantion* 37 (1968), 14–15.

<sup>46</sup> E.g., Cedrenus, PG 121:600D. See Rydén, "The Church of St. Anastasia," 198–201. An epithet of Anastasia was φαρμακολύτριά: *Synaxarium CP*, 333–34; Janin, "Études de topographie," 147.

<sup>47</sup> G. Galavaris, *The Illustrations of the Liturgical Homilies of Gregory Nazianzenus*, Studies in Manuscript Illumination 6 (Princeton, N.J., 1969), 10–11; on the effect of such readings, see A. Moffatt, "Schooling in the Iconoclast Centuries," in *Iconoclasm*, ed. A. Bryer and J. Herrin (Birmingham, Ala., 1977), 88–89.

<sup>48</sup> Also the Myriad of Angels (Jan. 11) and St. Auxentius (Feb. 14); see Janin, *Églises*, 24. According to one tradition, Auxentius was buried in the monastery adjoining the Anastasia. See *Synaxarium CP*, 465, line 52; Janin, *Églises*, 24; *idem*, "Études de topographie," 143. This monastery is first attested in the 12th century, and an earlier tradition has Auxentius buried in the convent of the Trichinaria. Cf. *Synaxarium CP*, 465, lines 14–16; Symeon Metaphrastes, *Vita Auxentii* 66–67: PG 114:1436B–D; but see Janin, *Églises*, 488. Auxentius, a

rated the translation of Gregory's relics from Arianzus in Cappadocia to Constantinople by Constantine VII (913–959); part of his remains were placed in the Holy Apostles, part in the Anastasia.<sup>49</sup> Clearly Nazianzen's connection with the latter was still remembered in the tenth century and strengthened in cult: after an early morning processional from Hagia Sophia to the Forum, his σύναξις was celebrated at the Great Church, the Anastasia, and the Holy Apostles.<sup>50</sup>

I may mention here the two known instances of the Anastasia's role in the larger world of Byzantine ceremonial. Although it is little noted, the procession for the first inauguration of Hagia Sophia (December 27, 537), presided over by Justinian and Patriarch Menas, began at the Anastasia.<sup>51</sup> Second, on the feast of Sts. Sergios and Bacchos (October 7), the processions began with a chanting of the Trisagion at the Anastasia (Janin finds this "quelque peu étonnant"), then moved to the Forum before continuing to the saints' church for the σύναξις.<sup>52</sup> Circumstances seem to suggest that this twofold processional use of the Anastasia served as a symbolic confirmation of Justinian's orthodoxy, as well as a celebration of the recent victory over the Arian Vandals.

Overtures to the West between 533 and 536 had, on religious issues, culminated in a council denouncing Monophysitism, an abrupt reversal of Justinian's policy of reconciliation with the Monophysites. Pope Agapetus, in Constantinople in 536, had consecrated Menas patriarch (536–552) after deposing his predecessor, the Monophysite sympathizer Anthimus (535–536).<sup>53</sup> The Anastasia, as the fount of orthodoxy in the capital, was an undoubtedly pointed choice in the ceremonies inaugurating Hagia Sophia in 537, one that was not maintained under the changed climate in 562 for the second inauguration.<sup>54</sup>

Whatever Justinian's own shifting definition of orthodoxy, he went to some lengths to make the religion of the empire one.<sup>55</sup> The reconquest of North Africa from the Arian Vandals can, in part, be seen as a religious war. Significantly, Pope Agapetus was instrumental in sharpening Justinian's anti-Arian zeal in this instance. In 537 one phase of the

---

contemporary and friend of St. Marcian, is said to have opposed Eutyches and Nestorius at the Council of Chalcedon.

<sup>49</sup>Ebersolt, *Sanctuaires*, 91 and n. 3. Janin, *Églises*, 28, incorrectly gives the date as Jan. 23. January 19 is, however, a variant date for the commemoration; see *Synaxarium CP*, 402–4. For the depiction of the translation in art, see C. Walter, "Biographical Scenes of the Three Hierarchs," *REB* 36 (1978), 236–37. Only Symeon Magister, *Annales: Imperium Constantini Porphyrogeneti* 6: PG 109:817B, specifically mentions Gregory's relics at the Anastasia (on Pseudo-Symeon, see H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, I [Munich, 1978], 354–57).

<sup>50</sup>*Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, ed. J. Mateos, I, OCA 165 (Rome, 1962), 210; *Synaxarium CP*, 422–23. Cf. R. Janin, "Les processions religieuses à Byzance," *REB* 24 (1966), 77.

<sup>51</sup>Bury, *LRE*, II, 51 (briefly). Theophanes, A.M. 6030: *Chronographia*, ed. de Boor, 217; Cedrenus, PG 121:712A. According to *Synaxarium CP*, 338, the inauguration of Hagia Sophia was commemorated on Dec. 22, St. Anastasia's feast day!

<sup>52</sup>Janin, "Les processions," 74.

<sup>53</sup>Bury, *LRE*, II, 376–78; E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, II (Paris, 1949), 382ff; H. G. Beck, "The Early Byzantine Church," in *History of the Church*, ed. H. Jedin and J. Dolan, II (New York, 1980), 445f; cf. R. Browning, *Justinian and Theodora* (London, 1987), 142–51; D. M. Olster, "Justinian, Imperial Rhetoric, and the Church," *BSI* 50 (1989), 165, 170–72.

<sup>54</sup>The vigil preceding took place at St. Platon; see Janin, "Études de topographie," 150–52. Cf. Paulus Silentiarius, *Descriptio S. Sophiae*, 331–36, ed. P. Friedländer (Leipzig-Berlin, 1912), 236, 275–76.

<sup>55</sup>Bury, *LRE*, II, 361–72; Beck, "The Early Byzantine Church," 456; Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, 814, 830–31, 854; Kaegi, "Arianism," 24 n. 4 and the literature cited there; and, notably, Olster, "Justinian," 165–76.

Vandalic War had just been concluded with the successful quelling of an Arian-inspired rebellion.<sup>56</sup> In such a context, the processional from the Anastasia can indeed be viewed as triumphant.

The Anastasia's role in the ceremonial for the feast of Sts. Sergios and Bacchos is recorded in the *Typikon* of the Great Church (10th century).<sup>57</sup> That we should assume an origin for this role in the reign of Justinian seems quite likely.<sup>58</sup> According to C. Mango, the church of Sts. Sergios and Bacchos was built for a Monophysite monastery sometime between 527 and 536, probably closer to the latter.<sup>59</sup> Following Justinian's precipitate change of religious policy in 536, however, the abbot of that monastery joined in condemning Monophysitism in the council held that year.<sup>60</sup> Including the Anastasia in the itinerary for the feast day must surely have been a significant symbol of orthodoxy and even of purification. The chanting of the uninterpolated Trisagion underscored the anti-Monophysite character of the ceremony.<sup>61</sup>

It seems clear that Ardabur and Aspar must have been aware of the history and character of the Anastasia when they made their donative. The gift of ecclesiastical vessels and Marcian's provision for Gothic-language readings at the church should undoubtedly be seen, in part, as political statements, and, as argued below, in the context of the translation of St. Anastasia's relics.

## II. THE *VITA MARCIANI*

There are two pre-Metaphrastic versions of the Life of St. Marcian: one written by a near contemporary, an otherwise unknown Sergius, and dating to the late fifth century, the other an undoubtedly subsequent abridgment. Scholars have not sufficiently noted the value of the longer version, possibly because the Metaphrast appears to have the fullest account.<sup>62</sup> M. Gedeon's edition of Sergius is, however, based on only one manuscript which, as shown below, is missing two folios. In fact, the Metaphrast is simply a rewrite of Sergius.<sup>63</sup> As in so many other instances, a critical edition of the *Vita Marciani* is a desideratum.

<sup>56</sup>Kaegi, "Arianism," 23, 39–48; cf. idem, *Byzantine Military Unrest*, 47–48.

<sup>57</sup>*Typikon*, ed. Mateos, I, 62–65.

<sup>58</sup>Cf. M. McCormick, "Analyzing Imperial Ceremonies," *JÖB* 35 (1985), 4, cf. 6; Janin, "Les processions," 69.

<sup>59</sup>"The Church of Saints Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople and the Alleged Tradition of Octagonal Palatine Churches," *JÖB* 21 (1972), 189–93; idem, "The Church of Saints Sergius and Bacchus Once Again," *BZ* 68 (1975), 385–92; and, most recently, I. Shahid, "The Church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus in Constantinople: Who Built It and Why?" *BSCAbstr* 22 (1996), 84, argues for a 527 foundation date that does not exclude an association with Monophysitism. See also G. Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire: Études sur le recueil des "Patria"* (Paris, 1984), 321 n. 29, and T. F. Mathews, *The Early Churches of Constantinople* (University Park, Pa., 1971), 47.

<sup>60</sup>Janin, *Églises*, 451; Mango, "The Church Again," 386.

<sup>61</sup>The Monophysite clause in the Trisagion had caused riots in 512: Bury, *LRE*, I, 438–39; Al. Cameron, *Circus Factions* (Oxford, 1976), 132–33. See also Justinian, *Tractatus contra Monophysitas*, PG 86.1:1141BC; J. Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Crestwood, N.Y., 1975), 34–35. The emperor's Monogenes Hymn was included in the liturgy, probably in 535/6: C. Stallman-Pacitti, *Cyril of Scythopolis* (Brookline, Mass., 1991), 49–50 and nn. 42 and 43.

<sup>62</sup>See above, notes 2 and 8.

<sup>63</sup>PG 114:429–56 = *AASS*, Jan. 1, Jan. 10:611–19 (*sic*), Latin translation of Gentianus Hervetus. The Metaphrast has altered and embellished the Greek in his characteristic fashion, rearranging some of the

The subscription to the longer *vita* reads: Ταῦτα ἐγὼ ὁ ἐλάχιστος Σέργιος ἐκ τῶν τὰ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς τούτου ἀκριβῶς ἐπισταμένων πολυπραγμονήσας, τισὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς παρατυχὼν, ἐκ πολλῶν ὀλίγα συνέγραψα, εἰς τὸ τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας ἔργῳ δοξάζειν τὸν θεὸν . . . (ed. Gedeon, 277 [93B1]).<sup>64</sup> ("I, the humble Sergius, having inquired into these events from those who accurately know about this father, and also myself being present at some, selecting a few things from many, composed this work, in order that those who read it may glorify God . . .")

That this subscription is authentic, in that it at least represents a contemporary not too far removed from the time of Marcian, seems guaranteed on internal evidence.<sup>65</sup> There are no chronological curiosities; no anachronistic descriptions of such things as church buildings, ecclesiastical vestments, or the liturgy.<sup>66</sup> There is very precise detail on topography, social institutions, and so on, that well suits the late fifth century.

The most telling indication is the recording of Ardabur and Aspar's gifts to the Anastasia. Another sign of early composition is the story of Marcian's attempt to buy property near the Forum of Constantine,<sup>67</sup> for his purported building of the Anastasia, from the widow Nico, a native of Antioch in Syria. She ultimately decided not to sell. The property was too valuable because it came with an *annona civica*, namely, the bread ration (here, oil also) or *panes aedium* established by Constantine I to encourage development in the city.<sup>68</sup> Symeon Metaphrastes (PG 114:433C), though he tells the story of Nico, eliminates

---

stories for compositional effect and occasionally eliminating details of importance for the social and economic history of the 5th century; see below. There has been very little stylistic analysis of the Metaphrast; see F. Tinnefeld, "Hagiographie und Humanismus: Die Darstellung menschlicher Empfindungen in den Viten des Metaphrastes," in *The 17th International Byzantine Congress, Abstracts of Short Papers* (Washington, D.C., 1986), 351–53.

<sup>64</sup>Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 189r, col. 2, reads: ταῦτα ἐγὼ ὁ ἐλάχιστος Σέργιος ἐκ πολλῶν ὀλίγα συνέγραψα. I.e., ἐκ τῶν . . . παρατυχὼν is omitted, either due to homeocatacrisis of ἐκ τῶν with ἐκ πολλῶν or because the phrase guaranteeing authenticity was a later insertion.

<sup>65</sup>On hagiographical subscriptions, see Aigrain, *L'hagiographie*, 201–2.

<sup>66</sup>For one apparent exception, see note 82.

<sup>67</sup>Ed. Gedeon, 273 (87A2): the house was situated in the semicircle of the anteforum of Constantine. Marcian paid more than two thousand gold pieces (ὕπερ τοὺς δισχιλίους χρυσοὺς) for the deed of sale (ὠνάς, Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 178r, col. 1, probably the original reading; cf. ὠναῖς, ed. Gedeon, 273 [87B2]; ἀγοράς, "provisions," ed. Gedeon, 273 [87B1]) and was willing to pay double that (ed. Gedeon, 273 [87B2]). The *Patria Constantinopolis* (III.43: ed. T. Preger, *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum* [Leipzig, 1901; repr. New York, 1975], 233) locates the property in τὰ Ψηφᾶ (R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 2nd ed. [Paris, 1964], 419) and says it cost 2,000 nomismata ("gold coins"), a tidy sum. Nicholas of Sion, in the 6th century, built a shrine to the Theotokos for 400 nomismata: *The Life of St. Nicholas of Sion*, chap. 69, ed. and trans. I. and N. P. Ševčenko (Brookline, Mass., 1984), 102; cf. chap. 58, pp. 92 and 138 (*nomisma*). See also, on the terminology for and value of late antique coinage, E. A. Clark, *The Life of Melania the Younger*, trans. and commentary (New York-Toronto, 1984), 95–96.

<sup>68</sup>Ed. Gedeon, 273 (87B1–B2):

[Ἀλλ' ὁ] ἀρχέκακος ἐχθρὸς, πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀντισπεύδων καὶ ᾧδε πρὸς ἐμποδισμὸν τοῦ τοιοῦτου ναοῦ οὐδ' ὀλίγων ἡμερῶν ἐνδοὺς καιρὸν, ἐπὶ μετὰ μελόν ἤγαγε τὸ γύναιον, ὑποβάλλων σοφιστικῶς ὡς εἴη κωμωδουμένη ὑπὸ πολλῶν οὐδὲ βραχὺ[ν] χρόνον διακατασχέειν δυνηθεῖσα τὴν ἀνδρικὴν οἴκησιν καίτοι εὐπρόσδοκον αὐτὴν πρὸς παραμυθίαν ἔχουσα στεγασμῶν τε πρὸς πορισμὸν καὶ πολιτικῶν ἡμερησίων ἄρτων χορηγία· οἵτινες αὐτῇ καὶ συνεπράθησαν κατὰ τὸ τῶν λοιπῶν οἰκῶν δίκαιον· τούτους γὰρ τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ μέγας ἐν βασιλεῦσι Κωνσταντῖνος οὐ μόνον τῷ δήμῳ τῆς ἐνδόξου ταύτης πόλεως ἀλλ' ἰδικῶς καὶ ταῖς οἰκίαις αὐτῆς, αἷς εὗρεν διένειμεν μετὰ καὶ ἐλαίου οὐγκίαις<sup>1</sup> ἡμερησίας καθ' ἕκαστον ἄρτον,<sup>2</sup> ἅτινα οἰκιακὰ σιτηρέσια καὶ ἰδίαν ἀπογραφὴν. . . . σίους ἔχει. . . .<sup>3</sup>

this anachronistic detail for his tenth-century audience. The *panes aedium* appear not to have been granted for new construction beyond 361, but the privileges extended through the sixth century.<sup>69</sup>

The terminology used for the Virgin Mary also seems to fit the late fifth century. Sergius refers to her as ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἄχραντος μήτηρ (ed. Gedeon, 274 [89A1]), that is, he calls her the “mother of God,” but avoids using the term θεοτόκος. This passage is modeled on Sozomen (*HE* 7.5.2), who, writing shortly after the Council of Ephesus in 431 accepted θεοτόκος as an epithet for Mary, instead calls her αὐτὴ ἡ Χριστοῦ μήτηρ Μαρία ἡ ἁγία παρθένος. Other contemporaries, such as Cyrus of Panopolis, who is credited with dedicating the first church to Mary in the capital (A.D. 439), also avoid the contentious title.<sup>70</sup> The Metaphrast, long since removed from the Nestorian controversy, comfortably rewrites Sergius’ descriptive phrase as αὐτὴ ἡ κοινὴ Βασιλὶς πάντων, ἡ ἄχραντος θεοτόκος (PG 114:441B).

The shorter *Vita Marciiani* is an edited version of Sergius, done by one Thomas (Gen. 33, fol. 141v), most likely for a menologion.<sup>71</sup> Concentrating on Marcian as *oikonomos* and church builder, it omits stories and details, and there is some rearrangement; words and

1. οὐγκίας: Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 178v, col. 1.

2. καθ’ ἕκαστον, *ibid.*: καθ’ ἑκάστην, ed. Gedeon, 273 n. 3.

3. ἀπογραφὴν ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις ἔχει κώδιξι τῷ τάγματι τῶν οἰκιῶν ἠφορισμένα καὶ ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν: Vat. gr. 1638, *ibid.*

But the Devil, who eagerly opposes everything good, granted not even a few days respite in hindering such a holy church and influenced the woman to repent her decision. He suggested sophistically that she would be a laughingstock if she were not even able to inhabit her husband’s house for a brief time, although she had it easily accessible for her comfort, for the profit from the rents, and for the supplies from the daily public bread dole, which was sold with it in accordance with the property rights of the rest of the houses. For Constantine, great among kings, distributed this bread not only to the people of this wonderful city, but also to each of the houses that he found. Each house also had a daily measure of olive oil. These domestic provisions have their own registration in the public codices under the rank of houses.

On the *annona civica*, see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey* (Norman, Okla., 1964) (hereafter *LRE*), I, 696–97; H. G. Beck, “Großstadt-Probleme: Konstantinopel vom 4.–6. Jahrhundert,” in *Studien zur Frühgeschichte* (as in note 30 above), 6; and most recently J. Durliat, *De la ville antique à la ville byzantine: Le problème des subsistances* (Rome, 1990), 188–206; cf. Dagron, *Naissance*, 504 (donation of Olympias), 530–35, 539. Dagron (p. 520) suggests that the deal may have fallen through because Marcian could not tear the house down. See also Saradi, “Notes on the *Vita*,” 19–20, for the significance of this evidence for the *annona* in the 5th century.

<sup>69</sup>Dagron, *Naissance*, 520, 535; according to B. Kubler in *RE* 18<sup>3</sup> (1983), 606, the *panes aedium* were in effect until 618. See also C. Strube, “Der Begriff Domus in der Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae,” in *Studien zur Frühgeschichte* (as in note 30 above), 125–26.

<sup>70</sup>Cyrus calls Mary ἁγία παρθένος and μήτηρ ἀπειρόγαμος; see T. E. Gregory, “The Remarkable Christmas Homily of Kyros Panopolites,” *GRBS* 16 (1975), 318–19, 323–24; *idem*, *Vox Populi: Violence and Popular Involvement in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D.* (Columbus, Ohio, 1979), 88–100, and the literature cited there. Cf. W. Delius, *Texte zur Geschichte der Marienverehrung und Marienverkündigung in der Alten Kirche* (Berlin, 1956), 15–30; F. M. Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon* (Philadelphia, 1983), 213–40, esp. 234–37. In the 5th century, the overwhelming use of the term θεοτόκος is in the context of the controversy: Lampe, 639–41; e.g., Soc. *HE* 7.32.

<sup>71</sup>A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (above, note 2) has edited codex Hieros. Sab. 242, fols. 19ff. (For additional apparatus, see *idem*, Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας, V [St. Petersburg, 1898], 402–4.) On the manuscript, see A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der grie-*

forms of Sergius' middle ecclesiastical Greek are sometimes vulgarized.<sup>72</sup> The account of the gifts of the Arian generals Ardabur and Aspar to the Anastasia has been deleted, but the abridged *vita* would appear, from currently available editions, to have two stories related to the Anastasia that are not in Sergius.<sup>73</sup> In one story Marcian is miraculously clothed in imperial garments during the consecration of the Anastasia (chaps. 5–6: ed. P-Ker., 261–63); in the other he saves the Anastasia from the great fire in Constantinople in 465 (chap. 7: ed. P-Ker., 264).

Gedeon's edition of Sergius' *vita* is based solely on codex Athos, Koutloum. 37, folios 86r–93v.<sup>74</sup> It is clear, however, from another, unedited, copy of Sergius (Vat. gr. 1638, fols. 175v–189v)<sup>75</sup> that the two stories were originally in the longer *vita*. Folio 88v (Athos) ends with ἐν τῇ ἀ, while folio 89r begins with καὶ μαρτυρίας δέδωκεν. Gedeon noted a problem with the text (274, n. 1), but thought that only some words were missing. Collation with codex Vaticanus, folio 180r, column 2, ἐν τῇ ἀθλήσει, and folio 183r, column 1, νυμφίου δέδωκε (with variant reading; cf. ed. P-Ker., 265, lines 4–5, καὶ μαρτυρίας, δέδωκεν, and Gen. 33, fol. 136v, col. 2, καὶ μαρτυρίας δέδωκεν), shows rather (allowing for

*chischen Kirche*, TU 52 (Leipzig, 1939), 735. The unedited codex Genuensis 33, fols. 131–41v, another copy of the shorter *vita*, has the following subscription (omitted in Hieros. Sab. 242 [ed. P-Ker.]):

Ταῦτα ἐγὼ ὁ ἐλάχιστος Σέργιος . . . εἰς τὸ τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας δοξάζειν τὸν θεὸν (cf. above, p. 165) καὶ εὐχεσθαι ὑπὲρ τε ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἐλαχίστου καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἡμῶν Θωμᾶ τοῦ καὶ εἰς τήνδε συμπονήσαντός με τοῦ ἐναρέτου καὶ ἰσαγγέλου βίου τοῦ θεαρέστου ἀνδρὸς ἀπογραφῆν. διὰ τὸ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτὸν πολλάκις ῥυσθῆναι ἐκ τε θαλάσσης κινδύνων ἐκ τε βαρβαρικῆς χειρὸς ταῖς εὐχαῖς αὐτοῦ· ἵνα πᾶσιν ἡμῖν ἴλεως γένηται ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν ὅλων θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐπουρανίου ζωῆς μετόχους ἡμᾶς ἀναδεικνύων, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ προσκυνησίς [sic] σὺν τῷ ἀνάρχῳ αὐτοῦ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ παναγίῳ καὶ ζωοποιῷ πνεύματι νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.

[fol. 141v] I, the humble Sergius, . . . in order that those who read this work may glorify God [the following replaces the remainder of the original subscription, ed. Gedeon, 277 (93B1)], and may pray both on behalf of my humble self and our brother Thomas who labored together with me on this copy of the virtuous and angelic life of this God-pleasing man, for he has acknowledged that he was often protected from the dangers of the sea and from the hands of barbarians through the saint's intercession. (And we have labored) so that the maker of the universe may be propitious to us all, our God who proclaims us as sharers in heavenly life, to whom is the glory and the power and the honor and the veneration, together with his father without beginning and the all-holy and life-giving spirit, now and always forever and ever. Amen.

On the Genoa manuscript (11th–12th century), see A. Ehrhard, *Übertlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, TU 50, ser. 4 (Leipzig, 1937), 544–45. (I owe special thanks to Chiara Farragiano for obtaining a microfilm of this manuscript for me.)

<sup>72</sup>E.g., nominative absolutes replace genitive absolutes; optative used for subjunctive; periphrastic use of genitive absolute.

<sup>73</sup>The following stories are also omitted in the shorter *vita*: Niko's abortive sale of property to Marcian for the Anastasia (chap. 4); Marcian's resurrection of a pregnant woman at the consecration of the Anastasia (chap. 6); his conversion of prostitutes (chap. 12); forgiving the banker who cheated him (chap. 13); selection of weekly readings in honor of the saints (chap. 15); and healing a Roman noblewoman from an issue of blood (chap. 16). The *Synaxarium CP*, 379–80 (Jan. 9) adds nothing to the tradition. The Imperial Menologion *Vita Marciani* (BHG Auct 1034b) is largely an abridgment of the Metaphrast.

<sup>74</sup>See above, note 2. Ehrhard, *Hagiographischen Literatur*, 532, dates the Athos manuscript to the 10th century. Although Gedeon does on occasion cite variant readings from Papadopoulos-Kerameus' edition, he has vitriolic contempt (p. 271) for the Jerusalem manuscript (above, note 71).

<sup>75</sup>On the Vatican manuscript (11th century), see Ehrhard, *Hagiographischen Literatur*, 542–44. It appears to have been written at the Stoudios monastery in Constantinople. Cf. P. Canart, *Les Vaticani Graeci, 1487–1962* (Vatican City, 1979), 19–23, 163, 167.

differences in size in the manuscripts) that the two folios containing the stories mentioned above had simply fallen out of the Athos manuscript.<sup>76</sup> Both stories point to an anti-Arian moral, and it is important to confirm their attestation in the late fifth century.

The *Vita Marciani* is in many respects disappointing to the historian and does not have the same value as, for instance, the *Vita Danielis*.<sup>77</sup> Marcian is, however, a historical figure, the first named *oikonomos* of Hagia Sophia (ca. 450–472). We are told by Theodore Anagnostes (*HE* 376: ed. Hansen, 106) that he made the other churches of the capital responsible for their own revenues.<sup>78</sup> That he should oversee church building and renovation, and even use his own private resources, well suits his role as *oikonomos* and has historical parallel.<sup>79</sup> If he cannot be credited, as his *vita* claims, with the original Anastasia building (above, pp. 160–61), it would nonetheless appear reasonable that there is some historical basis for associating his name with the church. Although I cannot here attempt a full-scale commentary on the *Vita Marciani*, I will examine stories and their sources that are of relevance to both the history of the Anastasia and the propagandistic role of contemporary hagiography.<sup>80</sup>

Sergius has amplified the Life of Marcian with literary borrowings and the reshaping of oral tradition. Sozomen provides the model for the story of Marcian, during the consecration of the Anastasia, raising from the dead a pregnant woman who had fallen from the gallery. In Sozomen the story serves as a variant explanation for the origin of the name of the church, and no officiant, at the apparently ordinary service, is named, though Nazianzen can be implied from the context.<sup>81</sup> Sergius has simply transferred the story to Marcian and expanded Sozomen's account:

<sup>76</sup>Twenty-five lines of the Gedeon text equal one page of Vat. gr. 1638; 40 lines of the Gedeon text equal one page of codex Athos, Koutloun. 37. Cf. Ehrhard, *Hagiographischen Literatur*, 532 and 542. A collation of the Vatican manuscript with Gedeon's edition of the Athos manuscript reveals that (particularly in the second half of the *vita*) there are considerable variants, many of them explanatory glosses or interpolations not found in the Vatican manuscript. E.g., fol. 186v, col. 1 = ed. Gedeon, 275 (91A1), where a catalogue of the type of miracles performed at Isidore's martyrion is added (so too in ed. P-Ker., 268, lines 17–20; Gen. 33, fol. 139v, col. 2 [with variants]); fol. 186v, col. 2 = ed. Gedeon, 276 (91A2), where a description of processional participants is expanded (so too in ed. P-Ker., 268, line 28–269, line 1; Gen. 33, fol. 140r, col. 1). Four of these interpolations are of significance for the historian and are discussed here elsewhere.

<sup>77</sup>On the *Vita Danielis*, see, e.g., Jones, *LRE*, I, 217.

<sup>78</sup>Sergius (ed. Gedeon, 272 [86A2]) says Marcian was ordained priest and appointed *oikonomos* in the reign of Emperor Marcian (450–457). Theodore Anagnostes (*Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. C. Hansen [Berlin, 1971], 106) credits Patriarch Gennadius (458–471) with Marcian's appointment, but his account here has been influenced by tradition subsequent to Sergius; see below, p. 169. Emperor Marcian was well known for his strict economic measures, and it is likely he who appointed Marcian and approved his reorganization of church finances. Cf. Bury, *LRE*, I, 236–37, and Dagron, *Naissance*, 495, 508.

<sup>79</sup>"The great *oikonomos* controls all the possessions of the church and the collection of money from them. He also supervises them for the high priest and the church": *AASS*, Jan. 1:610. On priests and deacons building churches at their own expense, see E. Patlagean, *Pauvreté économique et pauvreté sociale à Byzance, 4e–7e siècles* (Paris, 1977), 196–97; cf. R. MacMullen, *Corruption and the Decline of Rome* (New Haven, Conn., 1988), 51 and 235 n. 178.

<sup>80</sup>Marcian's aristocratic origins, simple lifestyle, and ability to raise the dead and cure the sick are all stock hagiographic material. See, e.g., R. Browning, "The 'Low Level' Saint's Life in the Early Byzantine World," in *The Byzantine Saint*, ed. S. Hackel (London, 1981), 120–23; Patlagean, "Ancient Byzantine Hagiography," 103, 109, 114 nn. 10 and 12.

<sup>81</sup>Cf. Janin, "Études de topographie," 138. On hagiographical borrowing, see Aigrain, *L'hagiographie*, 277, cf. 204–5; Patlagean, "Ancient Byzantine Hagiography," 112.



ἐκκλησιάζοντος τοῦ λαοῦ γυνὴ ἐγκύμων ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπερφῶου στοᾶς καταπεσοῦσα ἐνθάδε τέθνηκε, κοινῆς δὲ παρὰ πάντων εὐχῆς ἐπ' αὐτῇ γενομένης ἀνέζησε καὶ σὺν τῷ βρέφει ἐσώθη. (Soz. *HE* 7.5.4)

ἐκκλησιάζειν μέλλοντος τοῦ λαοῦ, γυνὴ ἐγκύμων ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ εὐωνύμου μέρους ὑπερφῶου στοᾶς τοῦ λεγομένου κατηχομένου κατακύψασα πέρα τοῦ μέτρου καὶ καταπεσοῦσα ἐκ τοῦ ὕψους ἐν τῷ ἐδάφει τοῦ ναοῦ τέθηκεν· κοινῆς δὲ παρὰ πάντων καὶ αὐτοῦ Μαρκιανοῦ τοῦ ὁσίου γενομένης εὐχῆς ἐν τῇ λειτουργίᾳ, ἀνέστη ἡ γυνὴ καὶ σὺν τῷ βρέφει ἐσώθη. (ed. Gedeon, 274 [89A2])<sup>82</sup>

The Marian background for this resurrection story, in which the Mother of Christ is said to have revealed herself to the sick in dreams and visions at the Anastasia, is taken almost word for word from Sozomen. We may conjecture that the ultimate origin for this story is Nazianzen's poem, "Somnium de Anastasiae ecclesia" (lines 19–20: PG 37:1255), describing the attentive audience for his sermons: Αἱ δ' ἄρ' ἀφ' ὑψηλῶν τεγέων εὐκοσμον ἀκουῖν / Ἀγναὶ παρθενικαὶ κλῖνον ἅμ' ἐσθλογάμοις. ("And holy maidens together with goodly matrons gracefully leaned to hear from lofty roofs.")

Similarly, Sergius draws inspiration for his account of Marcian's building of the Anastasia, at the site of the original house chapel, from Sozomen (*HE* 7.5.1, 3) and Gregory, though here the latter is a more immediate source. Marcian, unable to purchase the widow Nico's property, finds his solution while reading Nazianzen: "Ἀναστασίαν ταύτην τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐπώνυμον ὄψεσθε πλατυτέραν εὖ οἶδα καὶ μείζω· τάδε μοι προλέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον." Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ μέγας πατὴρ ἡμῶν Γρηγόριος προφήτευσεν (ed. Gedeon, 273 [88A2]). ("You will see the Anastasia, this eponym of resurrection, become wider and greater, I know it well. The Holy Spirit prophesied it to me.' This then was the prophecy of our great father Gregory.")

G. Dagron quotes this passage as it is filtered through the patriographers (III.43: ed. Preger, 233) and thinks that it refers to an actual inscription. This is unlikely.<sup>83</sup> We are in a literary context, and, as Symeon Metaphrastes (PG 114:436A) rightly recognized, Marcian, or rather Sergius, had read Gregory's sermons, specifically Oration 42. Several passages from that oration contribute to the above version of the prophecy and are transferred, as Symeon notes, from the Anastasia as Nicene community (above, p. 159) to the Anastasia as church building.<sup>84</sup>

Theodore Anagnostes (530) says that Marcian was appointed *oikonomos* after his conversion from Novatianism.<sup>85</sup> The source for this nonhistorical assertion is both natural confusion with oral tradition about the Novatians and Sergius' appropriation of that tradition for the *Vita Marciani*. There had been a Marcian consecrated bishop of the Nova-

<sup>82</sup>Equal to Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 183v, col. 1 (with one variant: omit τοῦ ὁσίου). According to Mathews, *Early Churches*, 128–30, the earliest known use of the term κατηχοῦμενον to designate the gallery of a church is in the late 7th century. Its occurrence here may be an explanatory gloss.

<sup>83</sup>Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 152 and n. 99. *Patria*, III.43 (ed. Preger) is a distillation of the *Vita Marciani*; cf. above, note 67 and below, p. 177.

<sup>84</sup>Greg. Naz. *Or.* 42.6 and 26: ed. Bernardi, 62–64, 108.

<sup>85</sup>Theod. Anagn. *HE* 13: PG 86:172c; *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. C. Hansen, GCS, n.s., 3 (Berlin, 1995), 106. So too in the *Vita Auxentii* (Sym. Metaphr., PG 114:1380b). It remained a common misconception; see, e.g., George Monachus, *Chronicon Breve*: PG 110:757bc.

tians in Constantinople as recently as 438.<sup>86</sup> The Novatians also had an Anastasia church, named in a fashion similar to Nazianzen's, though in a concrete, not a metaphorical, sense. Under the semi-Arian bishop Macedonius (350–360), the Novatians, forbidden to worship within the city, carted their church stone by stone to Sycae and “resurrected” it there. Julian (360–363), characteristically, allowed them to “resurrect” it once again in its original spot in the quarter of the Pelargos.<sup>87</sup> This time they renovated (βελτιώσαντες) the structure, and it was still in use in the fifth century.<sup>88</sup>

The Novatian bishop Paul is reported to have saved that sect's Anastasia church from a fire in 433 (Soc. *HE* 7.39).<sup>89</sup> Similarly, Marcian is supposed to have saved the orthodox Anastasia from the devastating fire of 465.<sup>90</sup> There are differences in detail: Paul clung to the altar, while Marcian climbed the roof with the Gospel books, but the model for the story is certain.<sup>91</sup> We have no verbal allusions, in this instance, to the text of Socrates, but the story was probably a popular one in oral tradition, and, indeed, the Novatians celebrated the anniversary of the miraculous delivery of their church (August 17).<sup>92</sup>

The fire of 465 destroyed eight of fourteen urban regions. It passed through the Forum of Constantine, the Mese, and the Forum Tauri, that is, the vicinity of the Portico of Domninus where the Anastasia was located. Individual buildings, however, were spared, for example, Sporacius' mansion on the Mese, even though an adjoining chapel was burned down.<sup>93</sup> It would appear that the Anastasia also survived the fire, lending credence to the transposed miracle story.

We can see in Marcian's alleged rebuilding of Nazianzen's chapel, inspired by that symbol of orthodoxy himself, and in his miracles there a deliberate attempt to counter the popularity of the Novatian Anastasia, with its double “resurrection” and its publicly commemorated, miraculous escape from the fire of 433. The sect had no less important a sympathizer than Socrates, and, although Novatians were tolerated as schismatic brethren, there had been sporadic invective and legislation against them and they were restricted from building new churches. On the wane in the fifth century, the Novatians were gone by the end of the sixth. This was in part a process of assimilation, as even Novatian clergy were received into the church with ease.<sup>94</sup> In the *Vita Marciani* we can also see the working of propaganda. Marcian was not, of course, a converted Novatian as later tradition asserts; he and the orthodox Anastasia were simply heir to Novatian traditions.

<sup>86</sup>Soc. *HE* 7.46; cf. 4.9, for an earlier (384–395) Novatian bishop Marcian.

<sup>87</sup>T. E. Gregory, “Novatianism: A Rigorist Sect in the Christian Roman Empire,” *ByzSt* 2 (1975), 7.

<sup>88</sup>Soc. *HE* 2.38; Soz. *HE* 4.20.

<sup>89</sup>Gregory, “Novatianism,” 7; A. M. Schneider, “Brände in Konstantinopel,” *BZ* 41 (1941), 383.

<sup>90</sup>*Vita Marciani*: Sym. Metaphr., PG 114:440B–441A; ed. P-Ker., 264; Vat. gr. 1638, fols. 182r–183r; Schneider, “Brände,” 383–84.

<sup>91</sup>Cf. Janin, “Études de topographie,” 139 (who dates the fire to 1 September 461).

<sup>92</sup>Soc. *HE* 7.39; the actual day of the fire.

<sup>93</sup>Schneider, “Brände”; C. Mango, “The Development of Constantinople as an Urban Centre,” in *The 17th International Byzantine Congress, Major Papers* (Washington, D.C., 1986), 125, 127. Sergius' description of the fire's extent is not detailed (cf. *Vita Danielis* 45–46; ed. H. Delehay, *Les Saints stylites*, SubsHag 14 [Brussels, 1923], 42–44), but accurate (above, note 90).

<sup>94</sup>Gregory, “Novatianism,” 2 n. 4, 4–6, 8, 17; Chesnut, *First Christian Histories*, 176–77. Chrysostom (Homily 5.1: PG 63:491–94) simply castigates the Catharoi for their arrogant assumption of purity because they refrain from fornication and adultery.

Marcian's church-building projects, and related stories, are the decided focus of the *Vita Marciani*, occupying fifteen of twenty-two chapters in Sergius (Metaphrast), ten of fourteen in the abridged version. Although he is given passing credit for the building and refurbishment of other structures,<sup>95</sup> two churches are singled out: the Anastasia (nine chapters) and Hagia Irene in Perama (ca. four chapters). The latter existed at the time of the *Notitia* (ed. Seeck, 235), ca. 425–430, and was located together with the Anastasia in the seventh region.<sup>96</sup> The *vita* records that the two churches were regarded as sisters (ed. Gedeon, 276 [91B1]), and there are notable parallels in Sergius' treatment of them.

Both Hagia Irene and the Anastasia are renovated and enlarged because of a vision or prophecy. Relics are also translated to Hagia Irene—those of St. Isidore. The original choice of a site is changed (Anastasia); the chest holding Isidore's relics refuses to budge from the skeuophylakion of Hagia Irene, and Marcian, abandoning his search for a suitable site elsewhere, builds an adjoining martyrion.<sup>97</sup> Both churches have roles as healing shrines, and their construction suffers momentary setbacks because of the intervention of the devil.<sup>98</sup> The description of the rebuilding of Hagia Irene, however, is far richer in concrete detail and clearly the more historical of the two.

Hagia Irene in Perama, built on the water's edge, was the apparent victim of erosion. In the early 470s the sea encroached to the middle of the church, and Marcian oversaw what was probably a partial demolition, land reclamation, and the relaying of the foundations. The church is carefully described as an aisled basilica with a wood roof covered in lead; the altar was flanked by columns, the left one inclined slightly (the devil had tried to topple it).<sup>99</sup> It had a baptistry in the shape of the Sheep's Gate pool at Jerusalem with five stoas.<sup>100</sup> This was covered with multiple domes (θόλοι) inlaid with gold mosaic (χρυσόλιθος) and with paintings of figures of the sick (τὰ τῶν νοσοῦντων ἀπειργάσατο σχήματα, ed. Gedeon, 275 [90B2]).<sup>101</sup>

The dating for Marcian's renovation of Hagia Irene is relatively precise. According to

<sup>95</sup> Marcian is said to have decorated and painted (διαγράψας) St. Theodore in the Tenetrotos, to have built and adorned St. Stratonikos in Rhegium, and to have built a monastery at the church of St. John the Baptist which was near St. Mocius: ed. Gedeon, 276 (91A2–B2). All three churches have little or no attestation outside the *Vita Marciani*; see Janin, *Églises*, 153 (Theodore 13), 412–13 (Prodromos 8), 478–79 (Stratonikos).

<sup>96</sup> Janin, *Églises*, 106–7 (Irene 3); idem, *Constantinople byzantine*, 53. Cf. Dagron, *Naissance*, 393, 400, 512, and Mango, "The Development," 125.

<sup>97</sup> Ed. Gedeon, 275–76 (90B2–91A1); cf. ed. P-Ker., 268. On small attached martyria, see R. Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (Baltimore, Md., 1975), 111.

<sup>98</sup> On the Anastasia: above, pp. 162 and 168–69, and note 46; on Hagia Irene: ed. Gedeon, 276 (91A1) (ἐκάστω . . . οἴκον, omitted in Vat. gr. 1638, 186v, col. 1); ed. Gedeon, 275 (90A2–B2).

<sup>99</sup> Ed. Gedeon, 274–75 (89A2–90B2). On the basilica as standard in 5th-century Constantinople, see Krautheimer, *Architecture*, 111. According to Sergius (90A1), Hagia Irene had galleries: τὰς τε κάτω στοὰς καὶ τὰς ὑπερκειμένας εἰργάσατο· εἶτα διαλαβὼν ὑπαίθροις τὸν οἶκον πανταχόθεν οὕτως τὴν ὀροφὴν ἐπιτίθησιν. The term ὑπαίθρα has been interpreted as open-air galleries designed to minimize fire hazard: *AASS*, Jan. 1:615, n. d. Cf. Evagrius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.14 (hereafter *Evagr. HE*): ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia* (Amsterdam, 1964), 24, lines 13–15.

<sup>100</sup> φωτιστήριον: ed. P-Ker., 267, line 17; Gen. 33, fols. 138v, col. 2–139r, col. 1; Sym. Metaphr., PG 114:445b (also βαπτιστήριον); φροντιστήριον (monastery): ed. Gedeon, 275 (90B1); Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 185v, col. 2. See A. Grabar, *Martyrium: Recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique* (Paris, 1946), I, 322–35, for the popularity of buildings in Palestine through the 6th century; cf. Krautheimer, *Architecture*, 78.

<sup>101</sup> Janin, *Églises*, 564, and Miller, *Birth of the Hospital*, 81, cite the *Patria* (III.44: ed. Preger, 234) as evidence for Hagia Irene as the oldest hospital in Constantinople. No other evidence supports Marcian's building of the *nosokomeion* in operation there at a later date, and here, as in chap. 43 (see above, note 83), the *Patria*

the *vita*, Gennadius (bp. 458–471), in fulfillment of a vision, tore down the old church in order that a larger one might be built under his successor Acacius (471–489).<sup>102</sup> Since Marcian died before its adornment and dedication (January 20) and Empress Verina completed it, the reconstruction dates to 471–474, that is, after the death of Gennadius and before the death of Leo I.<sup>103</sup> Verina's adornment of the church and gilding of the ceiling were recorded in an inscription (ὥσπερ δηλοῦται καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐν αὐτῇ ἐπιγραφῆς).<sup>104</sup>

In contrast, for the Anastasia the only chronology Sergius provides is that of the dedication (ἐγκαινισμός),<sup>105</sup> December 22, the date of St. Anastasia's martyrdom and her feast day. Gennadius presides at the ceremony—the occasion of the imperial garments miracle—and this *may* give an *ante quem* of 471 for any remodeling by Marcian. Clearly, the miraculous deliverance of the church from the 465 fire should be used with caution in establishing a chronology for the Anastasia.

Sergius describes Marcian's new Anastasia as surrounded like a pearl by προαύλια (outbuildings) and many-colored open-air stoas (στοαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ὑπαίθροις κυκλόθεν, ed. Gedeon, 274 [88B1]), recalling Sozomen's reference to the beauty and magnitude of its structures (οἰκοδομημάτων κάλλος τε καὶ μέγεθος, *HE* 7.5.2). The saint is said to have gilded the ceiling, beautified the lower stoas with paintings, and furnished a silver-sheathed altar. He also added a baptistry and skeuophylakion.<sup>106</sup> The latter's costly liturgical vessels are later (ed. Gedeon, 277 [92B1–B2]) identified as the gift of Ardabur and Aspar.

Despite this apparent detail, the only concrete architectural reference is to the fate of

---

simply indicates familiarity with the *Vita Marciani*. Though the *Vita Marciani* (ed. Gedeon, 275 [90B1–2]) refers in passing to people “freed from various diseases (νόσων ποικίλων) and all earthly discontent” at the baptistry, the primary emphasis is on the metaphorical healing of sins through baptism. For archaeological evidence confirming healing scenes in baptistries, see Saradi, “Notes on the *Vita*,” 23–24.

<sup>102</sup>Ed. Gedeon, 274 (88B1 [sic]). Most recently on Gennadius, see J. Declerck, “Le Patriarche Gennade de Constantinople (458–471) et un opuscule inédit contre les Nestoriens,” *Byzantion* 60 (1990), 131 n. 4 and the bibliography cited there. For Acacius, see M. Jugie in *DHGE* 1 (Paris, 1912), cols. 244–48.

<sup>103</sup>Verina is, however, active under Zeno through 478; see P. Chuvin, *A Chronicle of the Last Pagans* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990), 98. For Zeno, a great church builder, see Krautheimer, *Architecture*, passim. It is unclear why Janin (*Églises*, 106) dates the reconstruction to 455–460.

<sup>104</sup>Ed. Gedeon, 276 (91B1). The inscription and the dedication date appear to be part of a knowledgeable interpolation; ὥσπερ δηλοῦται . . . μάρτυρος Ἀναστασίας is omitted in Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 187r, col. 1. Cf. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie*, 198–200.

<sup>105</sup>Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 180r, col. 2; ἐγκαινισμός, ed. Gedeon, 274 (88B2).

<sup>106</sup>The description is problematic. Are the outbuildings the baptistry, skeuophylakion, Nazianzen's chapel (see below), or are the προαύλια “vestibules”? *Stoa* is a very general term; here it would seem used with two meanings: cf. G. Downey in Procopius, *Buildings* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940), xvi–xvii, 25. For a church inside a *stoa*, cf. Procopius, *Buildings*, I.vi.13, and for a circular *stoa*, see *ibid.*, I.viii.12. Both ed. Gedeon, 274 (88B2), and Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 180r, col. 1, read ὑποκειμένας στοάς; the shorter *Vita Marciani*, however, says the upper *stoas*, i.e., the galleries, had paintings (ed. P-Ker., 261, lines 19–20: ὑπερκειμένας στοάς; Gen. 33, fol. 133v, col. 2: ὑπερκειμένας στοαῖς). In 401 Chrysostom installed the Tall Brothers in monastic cells contiguous to the Anastasia: Janin, *Églises*, 23. Emperor Basil I (876–886) is also credited with gilding the ceiling: *Patria*, III.43: ed. Preger, 234; cf. *Vita Basilii*, ed. I. Bekker, *Theophanes Continuatus*, V, CSHB 33 (Bonn, 1838), 324, where he is said to have replaced a wooden roof with stone. The term *skeuophylakion* is used in the story of the imperial garments miracle as the place where the clergy gathered after the liturgy: ed. P-Ker., 263, line 4; Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 181r, col. 2; Gen. 33, fol. 135r, col. 1. On *skeuophylakia*, see G. Babić, *Les chapelles annexes des églises byzantines* (Paris, 1969), 58–64; Mathews, *Early Churches*, 158–62.

Nazianzen's original house chapel. Marcian left the oratory in its earlier form (ἐπὶ τοῦ προτέρου σχήματος, ed. Gedeon, 274 [88B1]) as a proof of Nazianzen's prophecy (above, p. 169). It lay to the north of the larger church, and according to Socrates (above, pp. 160–61) was adjoined to it.<sup>107</sup> Even in the tenth century, Gregory the Presbyter can comment on the small size of the chapel that anyone could ascertain by viewing the old building (τὸ παλαιὸν αὐτῆς τέμενος, PG 35:276C).<sup>108</sup>

Liturgical rather than architectural detail characterizes Sergius' treatment of the Anastasia, and, significantly, the dedication ceremony is for the translation of St. Anastasia's relics.<sup>109</sup> The emperors, Senate, and populace carrying candles escort (προπέμποντες) the relics. Marcian, during the procession, secretly gives away his chiton to a poor man and is left clothed only in his chasuble (φελώνιον).<sup>110</sup> He is designated by Archbishop Gennadius to perform the eucharistic offering (ἀναφορά), and, as he is washing his hands at the kiss of peace (ἀσπασμός), the archbishop and the attendant priests see an imperial robe (βασιλικὴ στολή) beneath his chasuble. At the communion (κοινωνία) the laity also notice the robe. At the conclusion of the liturgy, when the clergy have retired to the skeuophylakion, Gennadius upbraids Marcian for wearing imperial garments, but lifting up his chasuble finds him naked.<sup>111</sup> The miracle is interpreted as a victory over the devil and the heresy of Arius.

As noted above (p. 161), the new Anastasia dates to the late fourth century, and Marcian cannot be credited with its building. Janin suggests that he may have done some restorative work after a fire or earthquake, but if so we have no record of a natural disaster in Constantinople other than the fire of 465, which the church survived.<sup>112</sup> The obvious occasion when Marcian may have remodeled the Anastasia, giving rise to the notion that he actually built it, would have been for the reception of the relics of the like-named saint. The emphasis in Sergius' account on the *translatio* supports this hypothesis, as does the common phenomenon of "restorers" being credited with the original building.<sup>113</sup>

But once again, when we compare Sergius' discussion of Hagia Irene with that of the Anastasia, we note the relative precision of the location of the relics of St. Isidore. We are specifically told that Marcian ultimately built a martyrion adjacent to Hagia Irene for the saint (ed. Gedeon, 274 [89A2]; 275–76 [91A1]).<sup>114</sup> With the Anastasia we are left largely to

<sup>107</sup>Ed. Gedeon, 273 (88A2): τὸν (εὐκτῆριον οἶκον) μέχρι νῦν τῷ μείζονι αὐτῆς οἴκῳ κατὰ ἄρκτον; to which (with variants) ed. P-Ker., 261, lines 1–3, adds προσκείμενον; cf. Gen. 33, fol. 133r, col. 2, προσπαρκαείμενον, and the Metaphrast's rewording: PG 114:436B. For the liturgical use of such annexed chapels, see Babić, *Chapelles annexes*, 9–10.

<sup>108</sup>For τέμενος = church building, see ed. Gedeon, 273 (87A2); cf. Procopius, *Buildings*, I.iii.17.

<sup>109</sup>Ed. P-Ker., 262–63; Vat. gr. 1638, fols. 180r, col. 2–182r, col. 1; cf. Sym. Metaphr., PG 114:436D–440A. See Ebersolt, *Sanctuaires*, 106, for the distinction between consecration and dedication. On the sources for Byzantine liturgy, see Mathews, *Early Churches*, 111–15.

<sup>110</sup>On the *phelonion*, see Walter, *Art and Ritual*, 13, 14, 23.

<sup>111</sup>For the early liturgy, see Mathews, *Early Churches*, 162–63, 170–73; Babić, *Chapelles annexes*, 60.

<sup>112</sup>Janin, "Études de topographie," 138–39. See V. Grumel, *Traité d'études byzantines*, I: *La chronologie* (Paris, 1958), 477–78.

<sup>113</sup>E.g., Theodosius II, Pulcheria, Verina, and Justin II have all been credited with the church of the Virgin at Chalkoprateia; see Mathews, *Early Churches*, 28. Justin II was clearly only a restorer; see Av. Cameron, "The Artistic Patronage of Justin II," *Byzantion* 50 (1980), 77–78; cf. Babić, *Chapelles annexes*, 36–37.

<sup>114</sup>Cf. Babić, *Chapelles annexes*, 35, 39 (chapel of the Holy Reliquary).

conjecture. Was a crypt readied for the *depositio* beneath the new silver altar?<sup>115</sup> Were the relics housed in Nazianzen's house chapel? The text of Sergius can be read to mean this:

ὃς ἐντυγχάνων τοῖς πνευματικοῖς λόγοις τοῦ ἁγίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου . . . ἔγνω καὶ τὴν . . . προφητείαν περὶ τοῦ οἴκου τῆς ἁγίας μάρτυρος Ἀναστασίας τοῦ ἐν τοῖς Δομνίνου ἐμβόλοις ὄντος, διδάσκοντος ἐν τῷ εὐκτηρίῳ αὐτῆς οἴκῳ τῷ ἀρχαίῳ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὰ λείψανα αὐτῆς ἕως τοῦ νῦν ἀπόκεινται, λέγοντος οὕτως . . . (ed. Gedeon, 273 [88A1])

who (Marcian), reading the inspired words of our holy father Gregory . . . recognized also the . . . prophecy concerning the church of the holy martyr Anastasia which is in the portico of Domninus, (made) when he (Gregory) was teaching in her old oratory, in which also her relics lie to the present day, and said as follows . . .

The relative clause (ἐν ᾧ) could, however, refer back to the church rather than the oratory or simply have the whole complex as an understood antecedent in Sergius' day. It could as well be an interpolation, weakening any arguments from grammar.<sup>116</sup> The Metaphrast (PG 114:436A), though he consciously corrects Sergius in this passage (above, p. 169), not only does not clarify the issue for us but completely fails to mention the relics. In the absence of corroborating evidence, it seems prudent to leave their location a question.<sup>117</sup>

One important pattern, however, is clear. Marcian, in what must have been a natural role for an *oikonomos*, was charged with housing the relics of Sts. Isidore and Anastasia and in both instances did not build separate martyria but rather modified existing churches.<sup>118</sup> But was Marcian himself responsible for the translations? From the *vita* it would appear so, particularly in the case of Isidore. The bishops Gennadius and Acacius are the instigators of the restoration of Hagia Irene, but Marcian is said to have brought or recovered (κομίσας)<sup>119</sup> the relics of Isidore and to have been anxious to find a suitable resting place for them. Similarly, Marcian was intent on building a church for St. Anastasia, first on the widow Nico's property, then at the site of Nazianzen's chapel.<sup>120</sup> There is, however, no hint of when or by whom the relics were acquired.

It is interesting that Emperor Leo I (457–474) is nowhere mentioned in the *Vita Marciani*. (One can hardly count the vague reference to “emperors” in attendance at the dedication of the Anastasia.) The piety of Leo I and his officers is well observed in the

<sup>115</sup>On the crypt under the altar of Hagios Ioannes Stoudios built in 463, see Mathews, *Early Churches*, 27; cf. 63–65, 67.

<sup>116</sup>Though Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 179r, col. 1, reads ἐν ᾧ . . . τοῦ νῦν ἀπόκεινται; cf. ed. P-Ker., 260, line 23: ἐν ᾧ . . . νῦν κατάκειται, and Gen. 33, fol. 133r, col. 1: ἐν ᾧ . . . νῦν κατάκειται.

<sup>117</sup>Berger (*Patria*, 446) assumes the relics were originally in the chapel. The faithful had access to them, at least in the 14th century; see Majeska, *Russian Travelers*, 289.

<sup>118</sup>In the East in the 5th century, martyria were characteristically adjuncts of a church proper: Grabar, *Martyrium*, 314–22, 335–56.

<sup>119</sup>Ed. Gedeon, 275 (90B2). The Athos manuscript (Koutloum. 37) reads κοσμήσας (275 n. 5), as does Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 186r, col. 2. However, ed. P-Ker., 268, line 6, and Gen. 33, fol. 139, col. 1, read κομίσας.

<sup>120</sup>The relics of St. Anastasia are introduced abruptly as follows: Μαρκιανὸς οὗτος ὁ μακάριος θερμῷ ζήλῳ κρατούμενος περὶ τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῶν ἀγιωτάτων ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ μάλιστα τῆς περιφανοῦς ἐν μάρτυσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἀναστάσεως διεννοεῖτο ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας τόπον ἐπιτήδειον, ἔνθα τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐγερεῖ τέμενος. . . . (ed. Gedeon, 273 [87A1–A2]). Gedeon (273 n. 1) proposes the reading Ἀναστασίας for the Athos manuscript's ἀναστάσεως. Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 177v, col. 2, reads ἀναστασίας, undoubtedly the original reading. Elsewhere in Sergius the church is consistently referred to as that τῆς ἁγίας μάρτυρος Ἀναστασίας (e.g., 273 [87A1]) or τῆς ἁγίας Ἀναστασίας (e.g., 274 [88B1]). On later understanding of the name as referring to Christ's Resurrection, which probably accounts for the Athos manuscript reading, see above, p. 162.

*Vita Danielis*, and Leo's reign is credited with any number of translations of relics and the construction of their attendant churches and chapels.<sup>121</sup> St. Symeon Stylites' leather tunic was brought to Constantinople for presentation to him.<sup>122</sup> The cult of St. Mamas was founded in the capital during his reign.<sup>123</sup> The construction of the church of the Virgin at Chalkoprateia is attributed to his wife Verina (among others).<sup>124</sup> The church of Blachernae and the deposition of the Virgin's robe are, according to one tradition, assignable to Leo I and Verina.<sup>125</sup> The *Vita Marciani*, it is true, lauds Verina's completion of Hagia Irene in Perama, but Leo is conspicuous by his absence. If Marcian was responsible for the translation of relics and, as his *vita* claims (ed. Gedeon, 276 [91A1]), had contributed his patrimony to church building, he reinforced the piety of Leo's reign. This may be the implication of the imperial garments miracle at the dedication of the Anastasia. Be that as it may, only Marcian's name and, no doubt significantly, those of Ardabur and Aspar are associated with the construction (remodeling) of the Anastasia.

### III. THE ARDABURS

For fifty years in the fifth century the powerful Alan family, the Ardaburs, played a dominant role in the army and imperial politics in East and West.<sup>126</sup> Ardabur Senior, consul in the West in 427, had conducted campaigns in Persia (421–422) and, as *magister militum*, was sent against the western usurper John (424). His son Aspar, the most prominent member of the family, served with his father against the usurper and was instrumental in securing John's downfall in 425. In 431 Aspar commanded an expedition against the Vandals in Africa, and in 441 one against the Huns, this time clearly as *magister militum praesentalis*. Aspar was kingmaker in the East, supporting Marcian (450–457) and promoting Leo (457–474), both of whom had served under him in the army.<sup>127</sup>

A silver shield is extant commemorating Aspar's consulship in the West in 434 and his son Ardabur's praetorship in the same year. Depicted with them are Ardabur Senior and Fl. Plinta, possibly Aspar's father-in-law.<sup>128</sup> The dynastic implications are clear. Arda-

<sup>121</sup> E.g., the translation of the relics of the three holy children from Babylon, *Vita Danielis* 92; ed. Delehaye, 87; Ebersolt, *Sanctuaires*, 108.

<sup>122</sup> *Vita Danielis* 22; ed. Delehaye, 23. Leo had unsuccessfully demanded the body of St. Symeon: Evagr. *HE* 1.13; ed. Bidez and Parmentier, 22–23.

<sup>123</sup> Ebersolt, *Sanctuaires*, 93.

<sup>124</sup> Above, note 113; also Janin, *Églises*, 237.

<sup>125</sup> Janin, *Églises*, 161–62; Babić, *Chapelles annexes*, 36–37, 39; cf. Walter, *Art and Ritual*, 147. Av. Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," in *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, *Studies in Church History* 13, ed. D. Baker (Oxford, 1976), 66–67 (repr. in Av. Cameron, *Continuity and Change in Sixth-Century Byzantium*, Variorum Reprints [London, 1981]), argues that Justin II and Sophia built the chapel for the Virgin's robe.

<sup>126</sup> *PLRE*, II, 137–38 (Fl. Ardabur 3), 164–69 (Fl. Ardabur Aspar), 135–37 (Ardabur junior 1); Jones, *LRE*, I, 181–82, 218–24, 323–30, and Bury, *LRE*, I, 222–25, 314–22. See also B. S. Bachrach, *A History of the Alans in the West* (Minneapolis, Minn., 1973), 41–51, 76, 98.

<sup>127</sup> O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, VI (Stuttgart, 1920), 270, 356–57; A. Demandt, "Magister Militum," *RE*, suppl. 12 (1970), 769–72. On Leo's accession ceremony, the first described in the *Book of Ceremonies*, see S. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, Calif., 1981), 164, 241–43.

<sup>128</sup> For the shield or disk, see R. Delbrueck, *Die Konsulardiptychen und verwandte Denkmäler* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1929), 154–56, pl. 35. For Fl. Plinta, *PLRE*, II, 892–93; Jones, *LRE*, II, 1104–5 n. 18. Plinta is credited with healing the Arian Psathyrian controversy (the Father had always been Father, even when the Son was not); Soc. *HE* 5.23; Soz. *HE* 7.17; E. A. Thompson, *The Visigoths in the Time of Wulfila* (Oxford, 1966), 135–38.

bur Junior was consul in the East in 447 and was appointed *magister militum per Orientem* by Emperor Marcian. Two other sons also held the consulship, Patricius in 459 and Hermineric in 465.

By 466, however, Aspar had lost his hold on Leo. His son Ardabur, for example, was implicated by the future emperor Zeno (474–475, 476–491) in treason with Persia and forced to resign as *magister militum per Orientem*. But the power of Aspar and his family was not so easily broken; only by assassinating Aspar and Ardabur in 471 was the way paved for Zeno. Even as late as 469, Aspar's son Patricius was declared Caesar and Zeno temporarily driven from Constantinople. He returned only in 471 after assisting in the assassination, an event that triggered a Gothic uprising in Constantinople and the revolt of the Goths under Theoderic Strabo.<sup>129</sup> It is in this context that I return to the *Vita Marciani* and the Ardaburs' donation to the Anastasia.

A passage in the *Vita Marciani* enumerating all those who loved and respected St. Marcian names a particular member of the Senate, Ardabur, identified as the son of Aspar with whom he had been enrolled among the patricians.<sup>130</sup> Although they were Arians, we are told, they at least revered the Father (αἰδοῖ τοῦ πατρός) and had provided the Anastasia with a number of beautiful and costly vessels, because they lived in its vicinity, north of the church. In return, Marcian had the Scriptures read in Gothic in the martyrion on festal days (αἱ ἐπίσημοι ἡμέραι).<sup>131</sup> This is the complete account of the donation.

Although Ardabur is singled out as the special donor, he was inseparable in contemporary minds from his more famous father, and both are said to have presented the vessels (σκεύη . . . προσήνεγκαν).<sup>132</sup> A later, and unreliable, tradition that the Ardaburs paid for the construction of the Anastasia is erroneous.<sup>133</sup>

The *vita* does not state when or in what circumstances this gift to the Anastasia was made, but in context one can assume Marcian's purported rebuilding as a likely time. As we have seen, some remodeling for the reception of the relics of the saint appears reasonable, and the generals undoubtedly made their donation in connection with the highly public and ceremonial *depositio*.<sup>134</sup>

Demandt has convincingly demonstrated that two ecclesiastical vessels inscribed with the name Ardaburios were gifts of Ardabur Junior. One is a silver goblet in the Dumbar-ton Oaks collection, the other a bronze disk and bell from a hanging candelabrum in the

<sup>129</sup>E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, I (Paris, 1959), 360–61; Demandt, "Magister Militum," 775–76; Kaegi, *Byzantine Military Unrest*, 26–27; P. Heather, *Goths and Romans, 332–489* (Oxford, 1991), 255–56, 268; *PLRE*, II, 1200–1202 (Fl. Zenon 7).

<sup>130</sup>Ed. Gedeon, 277 (92B1–B2): ὁ ἐν πατρικίοις (σὺν) Ἀσπαρι γραφεὶς Ἀρδαβούριος; Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 188r, col. 2: ὁ ἐν πατρικίοις Ἀρδαβούριος. Since both witnesses have a plural verb (προσήνεγκαν), the Athos manuscript undoubtedly preserves the correct reading. Aspar was *patricius* already in 451, Ardabur already ca. 453, though he appears to have lost this status in 466; Demandt, "Magister Militum," 765, 769.

<sup>131</sup>For Gothic as an Arian liturgical language, see Schmidt, *Die Bekehrung der Ostgermanen*, 284–96.

<sup>132</sup>The Metaphrast (PG 114:453D) lists Aspar first.

<sup>133</sup>*Patria*, III.43: ed. Preger, 233. Janin (*Églises*, 23, and "Études de topographie," 139) incorrectly reads (and cites) Sym. Metaphr. *Vita Marciani* 21: PG 114:453D–456A; the Metaphrast only adds to Sergius' account that the vessels were silver and gold.

<sup>134</sup>On the arrival of relics, see K. G. Holum and G. Vikan, "The Trier Ivory, Adventus Ceremonies, and the Relics of St. Stephen," *DOP* 33 (1979), 116.



Benaki Museum in Athens. The inscriptions on both objects are dedicatory.<sup>135</sup> Demandt comments on the piety of Ardabur; we can now add a third, though literary, witness to that “piety.” There seems little reason to question the accuracy of the *Vita Marciani* here.

Demandt narrows the provenance of the Dumbarton Oaks goblet to Antioch and environs—Ardabur served there as *magister militum per Orientem* (453–466) and owned property in Daphne. We do not know in which church the goblet was dedicated, but there certainly could have been Arian churches in the vicinity of Antioch in the mid-fifth century. The city had been a vital center of Arianism under Valens, and Theodoret is witness to the persistence of Arian belief in the area.<sup>136</sup> But the evidence of the *Vita Marciani* does not make this a necessary assumption. At the Anastasia, Ardabur dedicated vessels not only to a Nicene church, but to one that was a symbol of anti-Arianism in Constantinople. There is in this gesture, it would seem, something more than simple piety.

The explanation for the donative—that the Ardaburs were neighbors of the Anastasia—is found only in the Athos manuscript of the *vita* and is likely a gloss.<sup>137</sup> The *Patria* (II.71: ed. Preger, 188) mentions an οἶκος τοῦ Ἀσπαρος whose site is said by Janin to be unknown; he finds no reason to connect it with the cistern of Aspar that lay outside the Constantinian walls.<sup>138</sup> The *Vita Marciani* would, however, place the residence of Aspar squarely in the old city, that is, a little north of the Anastasia, and its location in the Emboloi tou Domninou (*Not. Urb. Cp.*, Regio VII) between the Forum of Constantine and the Forum Tauri.<sup>139</sup> This makes sense because of the residence’s proximity to the Strategion, or soldiers’ quarters in the city north of the Great Palace.<sup>140</sup> The *Patria* (II.99: ed. Preger, 204) also mentions a Stele of Aspar in the area of the Forum Tauri and notes (in a gloss) that his house passed to a certain Basileios.<sup>141</sup> Significantly, Dagalaiphus, Ardabur’s son-in-law, lived near the Forum Tauri<sup>142</sup> in a locale named after him.<sup>143</sup> The Goth Dagistheus’ name is later attached to baths built facing the Anastasia.<sup>144</sup> It is likely that throughout the fifth century the quarter was a Gothic neighborhood.

Evidence for a Gothic community in Constantinople dates from the time of Chrysostom (bp. 398–404). John’s first sermon in 398 was against the Arians,<sup>145</sup> and he actively fostered the orthodox Goths of the capital (and their co-religionists in the Crimea), desig-

<sup>135</sup> A. Demandt, “Der Kelch von Ardabur und Anthusa,” *DOP* 40 (1986), 111–17.

<sup>136</sup> See above, note 5; cf. Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon*, PL 51:929AB, a. 453, for an Arian priest of Emisena briefly in possession of the head of John the Baptist.

<sup>137</sup> Ed. Gedeon, 277 (92B2): οἶα πρὸς ἄρκτον αὐτῷ γειτνιώντες; omitted in Vat. gr. 1638, fol. 188r, col. 2.

<sup>138</sup> Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 316.

<sup>139</sup> The porticoes of Domninos were probably at the crossroads formed by the Mese and the Long Portico of Maurianos: Janin, *Églises*, 24–25. Regio VII was residential; see Strube, “Der Begriff Domus,” 127–28.

<sup>140</sup> R. Guiland, *Études de topographie de Constantinople byzantine* (Berlin, 1969), 3.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. Berger, *Patria*, 612–13.

<sup>142</sup> *Vita Danielis*, ed. Delehay, 76, lines 12–17; *PLRE*, II, 340–41 (Fl. Dagalaiphus 2); R. S. Bagnall et al., *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (Atlanta, Ga., 1987), 457.

<sup>143</sup> Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 331, cf. 352. Gainas’ house gave his name to a region in Constantinople whose location is unknown (*Patria*, III.109: ed. Preger, 252).

<sup>144</sup> *PLRE*, II, 341 (Dagistheus), and cf. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 331–33. The baths were begun by Anastasius and completed by Justinian. See also Berger, *Patria*, 439–42.

<sup>145</sup> *Contra Anomoeos*: PG 48:796–98; Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 46; cf. Frend, *Rise of Christianity*, 749 and 778 n. 44.

nating a church for them and preaching among them himself.<sup>146</sup> He provided as well for a Gothic clergy by establishing a monastery/seminary.<sup>147</sup> Presumably, the church in question was that of the orthodox Goths, “near the palace” (Zosimus 5.19.4), that was burned to the ground on July 12, 400, after Gainas’ brief “coup.”<sup>148</sup>

The exact identity, location, and denomination of this Gothic church is, however, unsettled. Synesius implies it was Arian (*De Prov.* 1268), but this is likely a barbarophobe generalization, not reliable evidence:<sup>149</sup> Chrysostom had refused Gainas permission for an Arian Gothic church in the capital.<sup>150</sup> Socrates (*HE* 6.6; cf. *Soz. HE* 8.4.17, ἡ καλουμένη τῶν Γότθων ἐκκλησία) does not specifically name or locate the “church of the Goths” other than to say it is inside the city walls. Despite later evidence to the contrary,<sup>151</sup> Zosimus’ statement that the church was near the palace appears the most plausible.

There is an oration that Chrysostom delivered during the course of a Gothic service (PG 63:499ff), according to its title ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐπὶ Παύλου. This St. Paul’s was the church of Macedonius that under Theodosius the Great (379–395) received—undoubtedly pointedly—the remains of the Nicene bishop Paul.<sup>152</sup> As some scholars have noted, the wording of the title argues for a church *beside* that of St. Paul,<sup>153</sup> a point certainly worth emphasizing since “the church of the Goths” was destroyed in 400, whereas St. Paul’s was still standing in the thirteenth century. J. Zeiller, however, interpreted ἐπὶ Παύλου to mean “beside the tomb of Bishop Paul.”<sup>154</sup> If St. Paul’s church itself were meant,

<sup>146</sup>Theodoret, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. L. Parmentier, 3rd ed., ed. G. C. Hansen, GCS 44 (5) (Berlin, 1998), 330; Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 78–79; J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l’empire romain* (Paris, 1918), 545.

<sup>147</sup>Dagron, *Naissance*, 466; K. G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, Calif., 1982), 70 and n. 87. The monastery was in τὰ Προμότου, i.e., on the Mese near the church of the Holy Apostles. See Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 417.

<sup>148</sup>Dagron, *Naissance*, 110–11; Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 149–50; Albert, *Goten*, 157–58 and n. 42. Most recently, Alan Cameron argues persuasively against an actual coup by Gainas, in *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius* (Berkeley, Calif., 1992), 199–223.

<sup>149</sup>Cameron, *Barbarians*, 385–86 n. 254; cf. also 38–39, and, in general, on Synesius’ dubious value as an eyewitness, 199–223. Cf. Zeiller, *Les origines*, 545; *contra* J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops: Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom* (Oxford, 1990), 190–91.

<sup>150</sup>Albert, *Goten*, 157 n. 41, effectively counters E. Demougeot’s (*De l’unité à la division de l’Empire romain, 395–410: Essai sur le gouvernement impérial* [Paris, 1951], 254 n. 111) contention that the Arians had a church inside the city. Even under Theodosius I (379–395) and during the immediate transition from the Arian to Nicene domination, the Arians were only allowed a church outside the (Constantinian) walls (St. Mocius); see Dagron, *Naissance*, 305, and Miller, *Birth of the Hospital*, 81–82. In Chrysostom’s time they used the church of St. John the Baptist (*Soz. HE* 8.5; *Soc. HE* 6.6: John the Apostle), 7 miles outside the city; see Janin, *Églises*, 414. Nestorius (428–431) also prohibited a church for the Arians in the city (Barhadbeshabba, *Histoire* 21: PO 9:529–30), and burned down an Arian chapel (*Soc. HE* 7.29); see Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 84. Like the Nicenes under Arian domination (e.g., the Anastasia), the Arians must have had house-chapels within the walls.

<sup>151</sup>The sources are collected in Cameron, *Barbarians*, 385 n. 254; e.g., the 7th-century *Chronicon Paschale*’s statement (PG 92:780AB) that many Goths were killed in the Leomakellion is probably historically suspect since the name derived from Emperor Leo’s assassination of the “Goths” Aspar and Ardabur.

<sup>152</sup>Janin, *Églises*, 394; Snee, “Valens’ Recall,” 408 and n. 72.

<sup>153</sup>P. Batiffol, “De quelques homélies de S. Jean Chrysostome et de la version gothique des écritures (1),” *Revue biblique internationale* 8 (1899), 568–69 (who identifies this church with the “church of the Goths”); Cameron, *Barbarians*, 385 n. 254; cf. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops*, 169 and n. 21.

<sup>154</sup>Zeiller, *Les origines*, 545 n. 5. According to Janin (*Églises*, 394), there is a variant ἐπὶ Παύλου. Ἐπὶ of place is more regularly “upon,” and it is worth noting that at least in 1200 the relics of Paul were under the altar.

there is no need to infer from Gothic services—as the Anastasia demonstrates—that this was *the* church of the Goths. Gothic services need only imply a Gothic audience.

The obvious, and traditional, candidate for a St. Paul's in the time of Chrysostom is the church of that name located by the *Notitia* (5th century) in Regio VII along with the Anastasia and St. Irene of Perama.<sup>155</sup> Although later evidence appears to question this localization,<sup>156</sup> the use of Gothic at the Anastasia in the third quarter of the fifth century lends credence to the traditional identification,<sup>157</sup> and, in any event, the cumulative weight of the evidence indicates that the core of Constantinople in that century must have had a significant Gothic population.

The Ardaburs' interest in the Anastasia, however, must have gone beyond mere neighborly goodwill. According to F. W. Deichmann, there was, under Theoderic, an important church in Ravenna dedicated to St. Anastasia (not to the Anastasis, i.e., Christ's Resurrection).<sup>158</sup> In supporting his contention, he finds the Ardaburs' association with the Constantinopolitan Anastasia,<sup>159</sup> as well as her Pannonian origin, compelling evidence for the saint's favor with the Goths. Anastasia is certainly among the company of martyrs depicted in St. Apollinare Nuovo, but Theoderic was a hostage in Constantinople from 461 to 471 (!) and inspiration for a Ravenna St. Anastasia church may simply have come from his experience in the eastern capital.<sup>160</sup> The question of the saint's Pannonian origin is more intriguing.

Anastasia's relics were brought from Sirmium, an area long associated with Arianism and, since the fall of Attila's Huns, a residence of the Ostrogoths. Anastasia was apparently revered in a chapel in a cemetery outside Sirmium and possibly in a basilica in the city as well.<sup>161</sup> The acquisition of the relics during the period following the Ostrogothic settlement in Pannonia certainly makes sense, as there was relative peace between

<sup>155</sup> Janin, *Églises*, 395 (first suggested by Du Cange).

<sup>156</sup> Janin, *Églises*: the *Typikon* appears to locate St. Paul's in Regio III, i.e., south, not north, of the Forum of Constantine. I have yet to locate the passage cited in Janin. He gives a faulty reference: I.90 is Paul the Confessor's synaxis on Nov. 6 at Hagia Sophia.

<sup>157</sup> It may be worth noting that in both homilies that Chrysostom delivered in the Anastasia he complains of low attendance: Homily 4: PG 63:477–86 (A.D. 398); Homily 7: PG 63:493–500 (A.D. 399).

<sup>158</sup> F. W. Deichmann, *Ravenna: Hauptstadt des spätantiken Abendlandes*, II (Wiesbaden, 1976), 301–3. Deichmann does not fully consider that ἀναστασία could be a colloquial form of ἀνάστασις; see above, note 44. See also Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 325–26, and Zeiller, *Les origines*, 545–46 n. 5, for a refutation of the suggestion that the Anastasia was the church of the Goths in Constantinople.

<sup>159</sup> Following Janin, *Églises*, 23, and Cedrenus (PG 121:712), Deichmann thinks the Ardaburs paid to have the church rebuilt to house the relics of St. Anastasia. Cedrenus and the *Patria* (III.43: ed. Preger, 233) (but not, as Janin claims, Sym. Metaphr., PG 114:456A) do credit Aspar with paying for construction. If so, why does the near contemporary *Vita Marciani* fail to mention it? See further below, and cf. the *magister militum* Anatolius' donation of a silver reliquary for the bones of the Apostle Thomas (A.D. 442): *PLRE*, II, 85 (Anatolius 10).

<sup>160</sup> See M. J. Johnson, "Toward a History of Theoderic's Building Program," *DOP* 42 (1988), 73–96. Theoderic may even have attended Gothic services at the Anastasia.

<sup>161</sup> Zeiller, *Les origines*, 188–90 (Anastasia in Sirmium), 535–37 (Arianism in Pannonia); and, on the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, E. Demougeot, *La formation de l'Europe et les invasions barbares*, II.2 (Paris, 1979), 776–83. St. Anastasia also had a cult following in the 5th century in the Chersonese: H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Brussels, 1933), 255; Zeiller, *Les origines*, 412; and particularly E. Kurtz in *BZ* 9 (1900), 308–10, a review of V. Latyšev, "Studien zur byzantinischen Epigraphik. 4. Einige mit Inschriften versehene Denkmäler der byzant. Epoche aus dem Taurischen Chersones," *VizVrem* 6 (1899), 337–69. (Kurtz entertains the possibility that this Anastasia was only a local saint.)

Romans and Goths for a decade (459–469),<sup>162</sup> and the dating accords with that of Anagnostes (458–471). Ardabur was serving in Thrace in the late 460s,<sup>163</sup> and, considering Aspar's connections in the Balkans,<sup>164</sup> could have acquired the relics for the capital. The *Vita Marciiani* mentions only Marcian's attempts to find a suitable resting place for them in Constantinople.<sup>165</sup> Circumstantial evidence, notably the Ardaburs' donation of ecclesiastical vessels to the Anastasia, suggests a more intimate involvement with the relics than the *vita* allows, but there is in the end no proof.

An important question remains. St. Marcian had the Gospels read in Gothic at the Anastasia on festal days. Can this imply that the services were Arian? The *Vita Marciiani* shows a spirit of generosity in acknowledging that at least the Arians had proper reverence for the Father, and the use of their ancestral language was meant to honor the Ardaburs for their donation. On the whole, it would appear more likely that the Ardaburs and their "fellow" Goths attended a Nicene liturgy much along the lines Chrysostom had established in the early part of the century.

As we have seen, the Anastasia was a long-standing symbol of Nicene orthodoxy, and the Ardaburs in their official capacities were frequently called upon to intervene in orthodox ecclesiastical affairs. Theodoret of Cyrrhus (Ep. 140, A.D. 450) thanked Aspar for helping rescind the acts of the Latrocinium (Second Council of Ephesus, A.D. 449), which had condemned him as a Nestorian. Pope Leo (Ep. 153.1, A.D. 458) asked Aspar—unsuccessfully—to oppose the Monophysite bishop of Alexandria, Timothy Aelurus.<sup>166</sup> Ardabur Junior, in 459 as *magister militum per Orientem*, was charged with protecting the remains of St. Symeon Stylites the Elder from relic hunters.<sup>167</sup> In general, the Ardaburs' official positions took precedence over their Arian beliefs, both in the eyes of others and in their own.<sup>168</sup>

In Arian Gothic Christianity there were some paradoxical tendencies. On the one hand, Arianism reinforced Germanic ethnocentricity, keeping the Goths distinct from their Roman-orthodox neighbors.<sup>169</sup> At the same time, the newly converted Goths exhibited more religious tolerance than did Roman Christianity;<sup>170</sup> the niceties of theological controversies were of little concern.<sup>171</sup>

<sup>162</sup> Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 260–63.

<sup>163</sup> Demandt, "Magister Militum," 764f.

<sup>164</sup> T. S. Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths* (Bloomington, Ind., 1984), 55.

<sup>165</sup> Interestingly, Marcian's first attempt was with the property of the widow Nico from Antioch in Syria where the Ardaburs were local proprietors. See above, p. 169.

<sup>166</sup> On Timothy Aelurus, see Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 189–91; cf. Leo, *Letters* 149–51: PL 54:1120–22.

<sup>167</sup> Evagr. *HE* 1.13: ed. Bidez and Parmentier, 22–23. For a general account, see G. Bardy, *Histoire de l'Église*, ed. A. Fliche and V. Martin, IV (Paris, 1948), 280–84; on the Ardaburs and ecclesiastical politics, see Kaegi, *Byzantine Military Unrest*, 76–78. See also L. R. Scott, "The Magistri Militum of the Eastern Roman Empire in the Fifth Century" (Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, 1972), 140–48.

<sup>168</sup> Cf. Demandt, "Magister Militum," 764, 779, 783; L. R. Scott, "Aspar and the Burden of the Barbarian Heritage," *ByzSt* 3 (1976), 66–69.

<sup>169</sup> P. D. King, *Law and Society in the Visigothic Kingdom* (Cambridge, 1972), 4–6; Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 16–17, 232 (with notes); Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops*, 49–50, 153.

<sup>170</sup> Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 197–202; Johnson, "Theoderic's Building Program," 79.

<sup>171</sup> Burns, *Ostrogoths*, 158–62, and, most recently, W. A. Sumruld, *Augustine and the Arians: The Bishop of Hippo's Encounters with Ulfilan Arianism* (London, 1994), 158–59.

Christology dominated fifth- and sixth-century religious politics; Arianism was significant only as the religion of the Goths. Because of their importance in the military, it was frequently deemed prudent to ignore the Goths' religious beliefs, but when circumstances dictated, it was possible to mobilize a powerful anti-Arian undercurrent against them. Long after its demise, Arianism remained the archetypal experience of heresy.<sup>172</sup>

It is outside the scope of this study to give a full account of the Ardaburs' fall from power during the period 466–471, that is, from Ardabur's recall to Constantinople on charges of treason with the Persians, and his subsequent dismissal as *magister militum per Orientem*, until the assassination.<sup>173</sup> The sources are problematic, and it is frequently difficult to ascertain whether allegations against the Alans were true or simply trumped up in order to curb their power.<sup>174</sup> To judge from the hagiographical sources, however, religion played a definite role in those final years to which I now turn my attention.

First, the events that led up to the Ardaburs' assassination: as early as 464 the seeds were being sown for their destruction. In that year two important military fronts were vested elsewhere: Basiliscus, Verina's brother, was appointed *magister militum* in Thrace, and Tatianus was envoy to the Vandals.<sup>175</sup> It is true that Aspar's son Hermineric was consul in the East in 465, but this was undoubtedly meant to placate a still powerful rival. Hermineric himself appears to have posed no serious threat; he eventually married a granddaughter of Zeno and died a natural death.<sup>176</sup>

The year 466 was the real turning point. Ardabur was removed as *magister militum per Orientem* on a charge of treason with Persia, an accusation contrived by Zeno who was himself appointed count of the domestics that year.<sup>177</sup> As has often been noted, Leo was playing one barbarian general against another, and in 467 Zeno became *magister militum* in Thrace (replacing Basiliscus) and married Leo's daughter Ariadne.<sup>178</sup> Also in 467, Leo appointed Anthemius western emperor, thereby both asserting Constantinople's authority and ridding himself of a potential rival.<sup>179</sup> In 468, in a continuing bid for indepen-

<sup>172</sup>On Photius' comparison of Arianism and Iconoclasm, see F. Dvornik, "The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm," *DOP* 7 (1953), 87–89, but for an opposing view on the strength of Iconoclasm in this period, see C. Mango, "The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photius," in *Iconoclasm*, ed. Bryer and Herrin (as in note 47 above), 133–40.

<sup>173</sup>See, e.g., the comments of W. Goffart, *Barbarians and Romans, A.D. 418–584: The Techniques of Accommodation* (Princeton, N.J., 1980), 34–35 and n. 55. See esp. A. Demandt, *Die Spätantike, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 3.6 (Munich, 1989), 183ff, 186f; and idem, "Magister Militum," 764–81. See also Heather, *Goths and Romans*, 251–63, passim; Scott, "Aspar," 59–69.

<sup>174</sup>Cf. Aetius' misrepresentation of Boniface, see Procopius, *History of the Wars*, III.iii.35–36. See also the discussion in Kaegi, *Byzantine Military Unrest*, 52–53, of Procopius' report of false accusations brought against Belisarius. For an analysis of source problems for the Ardaburs, see R. C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicizing Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus* (Liverpool, 1981), 33, 34, 50, 67, 80, 81, 83, 115, 166 nn. 24 and 25.

<sup>175</sup>Bagnall et al., *Consuls*, 465–67; *PLRE*, II, 1053–54 (Tatianus 1); Bachrach, *Alans*, 46.

<sup>176</sup>*PLRE*, II, 549 (Herminericus).

<sup>177</sup>Jones, *LRE*, I, 222.

<sup>178</sup>Heather, *Goths and Romans*, 255; *PLRE*, II, 1200–1201 (Fl. Zenon 7); Demandt, "Magister Militum," 766–67 (date of marriage to Ariadne as 466 or 467), 777.

<sup>179</sup>*PLRE*, II, 96–98 (Anthemius 3); F. M. Clover, "The Family and Early Career of Anicius Olybrius," *Historia* 27 (1978), 195 (Anthemius a "political menace" to Leo). Cf. J. M. O'Flynn, "A Greek on the Roman Throne: The Fate of Anthemius," *Historia* 40 (1991), 124–25.

dence from his one-time mentor, Leo ignored Aspar's advice for nonintervention and sent military aid to the Sciri in their war against the Pannonian Goths.<sup>180</sup>

Leo's expedition against the Vandals in North Africa in 468 was commanded by Basiliscus. Aspar went along as a military adviser, and the disastrous failure of the expedition was blamed on Aspar's advice in dealing with the Vandal king Geiseric.<sup>181</sup> Zeno's influence continued to wax as Aspar's waned: in 468 he advanced to *magister militum per Orientem*, saw the birth of his son Leo II, and in 469 was honored with the eastern consulship.<sup>182</sup> Once again rejecting Aspar's advice, in 469 Leo supported Anthemius' ill-fated attack on the Pannonian Ostrogoths.<sup>183</sup>

The revolt of Anagastes, the new *magister militum* in Thrace, in 469 was blamed on Ardabur, possibly rightly, and has been seen as the most important reason why Leo decided to murder the Alans.<sup>184</sup> Aspar was still in a position of power as *magister militum praesentalis* at the head of loyal Gothic troops and supported by the federated Goths under Theoderic Strabo (as the Gothic reaction to the assassination clearly shows); he and his son were by no means dispensable in time of crisis, for example, the Hunnic-Gothic invasion of Thrace.<sup>185</sup> They energetically sought to counter Zeno and his Isaurians. Aspar is said to have instigated mutiny among Zeno's soldiers, causing Zeno to absent himself from Constantinople from 469 to 471.<sup>186</sup>

It is in this period that Aspar's son Patricius was declared Caesar, and either betrothed or briefly married to Leo's other daughter, Leontia.<sup>187</sup> (If the marriage indeed took place, it was annulled. Patricius survived the assassination plot, and we later find Leontia married to Anthemius' son, Fl. Marcianus.)<sup>188</sup> The sources claim that Leo was trying to induce Aspar to remain loyal, while modern scholars attribute the elevation of Patricius to pres-

<sup>180</sup>Dating: Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 264–65, though others date this incident to 466, e.g., *PLRE*, II, 167. See also Burns, *Ostrogoths*, 54–55.

<sup>181</sup>Aspar is said to have advised against the expedition (he had commanded the expedition defeated in 431), and, according to Scott ("Aspar," 65–66), could have had the command if he wanted it. For Aspar's advice as the cause for failure, see, e.g., Theod. Anagn. *HE* 25; Procopius, *History of the Wars*, III.vi.2, 3, 11, 13–16. Jones (*LRE*, I, 222) attributes the defeat to Basiliscus' incompetence. Cf., on the question of Aspar's collusion, *PLRE*, II, 496–99 (Geisericus); C. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris, 1955), 200–205, esp. 202 n. 2; Bachrach, *Alans*, 47 and n. 55; Demandt, "Der Kelch," 114–15 (Ardabur = Anonymous 110 [*PLRE*, II, 1235] and also accompanied Basiliscus).

<sup>182</sup>The dating given here may be off by a year; cf. Demandt, "Magister Militum," 773–74, and *PLRE*, II, 1201.

<sup>183</sup>Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 263–65. (One of the *DOP* anonymous readers, however, interprets Sidonius, *Carm.* 2.377, as "no more than some kind of diplomatic contact.")

<sup>184</sup>*PLRE*, II, 75–76 (Anagastes). For Ardabur to blame, B. Croke, "The Date of the 'Anastasian Long Wall' in Thrace," *GRBS* 23 (1982), 65. For reason for assassination, Kaegi, *Byzantine Military Unrest*, 26.

<sup>185</sup>Above, note 129. Also Jones, *LRE*, I, 221–22; Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 259–60 and 265 (Aspar's second in command, a Hun, defeats Hunnic-Gothic forces). Invasion dated to 469: Demandt, "Magister Militum," 768; see also 764f for Ardabur's defeat of the Gothic king Bigelis under Zeno's command in 467–468.

<sup>186</sup>E. W. Brooks, "The Emperor Zenon and the Isaurians," *EHR* 30 (1893), 214; Demandt, "Magister Militum," 767–68; Croke, "The Date," 65–66. Jones (*LRE*, I, 222) attributes the mutiny to Zeno's unpopularity rather than Aspar's "machinations." According to Heather (*Goths and Romans*, 255), Ardabur tried to use Anagastes to kill Zeno, but (p. 263) Anagastes was won over by Zeno.

<sup>187</sup>Possibly A.D. 470: Brooks, "Emperor Zenon," 213–14; *PLRE*, II, 842 (Iulius Patricius 15). A.D. 468: Demandt, "Magister Militum," 772; Seeck, *Geschichte*, VI, 369.

<sup>188</sup>*PLRE*, II, 667 (Leontia 1); she was thirteen in 470. Demandt, "Magister Militum," 772, 774; married to Marcianus in 471–472; *PLRE*, II, 717–18 (Fl. Marcianus 17).

sure from Aspar.<sup>189</sup> In either case, it is worth noting that Caesars were unusual after Constantius II; designated heirs were more normally co-opted as Augusti. Leo, however, made an exception: he first appointed Anthemius Caesar and only when he reached Rome had him declared Augustus.<sup>190</sup>

Leo undoubtedly had no intention that Patricius would succeed him, but the incident must be viewed as a concession to the still powerful Ardaburs. To judge from the account in the *Life of Marcellus* of the popular riot in the hippodrome, Patricius' appointment as Caesar and imperial marriage were taken seriously by monks, clergy, and a frequently barbarophobe population.<sup>191</sup> The focus of the riot, however, was not ethnicity but religion. Significantly, Patriarch Gennadius and the archimandrite of the Akoimatoi (Sleepless Ones), Marcellus, stirred up popular reaction against the Arian Patricius. To what extent might this have been the design of Leo?<sup>192</sup>

Certainly the disastrous fire of 465 and the recent failure of the massive expedition against the Vandals hardly put Leo in a good light with the populace, nor for that matter did his courting of the Isaurians.<sup>193</sup> Aspar, on the other hand, seems to have enjoyed considerable popular favor. His construction, in 459, of the great cistern that still stands near the Sultan Selim mosque must have provided employment for many.<sup>194</sup> Tradition records his active role in combating the fire of 465 (Leo fled Constantinople for six months).<sup>195</sup> Leo's murder of the Ardaburs gained him the epithet "Macelles" (the Butcher).<sup>196</sup> Blaming Aspar for the failure of the North African campaign and "setting up" the Ardaburs for a popular attack on their Arianism reflect the complex maneuvering that characterized these years.

The *Life of Marcellus* (chap. 34: ed. Dagron, 316–18) records that Leo, Aspar, and Ardabur resolved to end their potentially mutually destructive enmity by conferring the rank of Caesar on Patricius and marrying him to Leo's daughter. This arrangement, we are told, disturbed the Church because an Arian might succeed to the throne. The *Life of Marcellus* emphasizes that Aspar and his entire family were afflicted with the "pagan madness of Arius" (ἐλληνικὴ Ἀρείου μανία). The Christian (i.e., orthodox) people and

<sup>189</sup>E.g., Evagr. *HE* 2.16: ed. Bidez and Parmentier, 66; Heather, *Goths and Romans*, 255; Demandt, "Magister Militum," 771; Jones, *LRE*, I, 222.

<sup>190</sup>Jones, *LRE*, I, 323. Leo acted similarly with his grandson Leo II who was proclaimed Caesar in October 473 and Augustus shortly before Leo's death in early 474: *PLRE*, II, 664–65 (Leo 7).

<sup>191</sup>G. Dagron, ed., "La Vie Ancienne de saint Marcel l'Acémète," *AB* 86 (1968), 316–18 (chap. 34). On the popular uprising against Gainas and his Gothic followers in 400, cf. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops*, 111–31, and Cameron, *Barbarians*, 199–223, 316–36. Anti-Germanism would appear sporadic and unorganized. It also cut across class lines: Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 24.

<sup>192</sup>Cf. (briefly) Bachrach, *Alans*, 48.

<sup>193</sup>Unpopularity of Zeno and the Isaurians: Bury, *LRE*, I, 389–90; Blockley, *Fragmentary Classicizing Historians*, 80–81 (on Malchus).

<sup>194</sup>Cistern of Aspar: Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 316; Beck, "Großstadt-Probleme," 10; C. Mango, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IVe–VIIe siècles)* (Paris, 1985), 49. In this period, the popularity of building projects is best illustrated by Cyrus of Panopolis, for whose meteoric rise and fall see Holum, *Theodosian Emperors*, 189–91. Cf. Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 142. For the stele depicting an equestrian Aspar bearing a lance set up near the Forum Tauri, see above, p. 177.

<sup>195</sup>Aspar is said to have paid citizens to form a bucket brigade: Bury, *LRE*, I, 332; *PLRE*, II, 167. For Leo, see *Life of Daniel the Stylite*, chaps. 45–46, in *Three Byzantine Saints*, trans. E. Dawes and N. H. Baynes (Oxford, 1948), 33–34 and 79 n.

<sup>196</sup>*PLRE*, II, 664; Scott, "Aspar," 63; cf. Heather, *Goths and Romans*, 236–37. See also Berger, *Patria*, 515–16.

clergy met at Hagia Sophia and from there went to the hippodrome, led by Patriarch Gennadius and the archimandrite Marcellus who had come into town from his monastery (the Irenaion, across the Bosphorus) specifically for this purpose.<sup>197</sup> There they intended to affirm the orthodox faith and to ready the emperor for action—not unwillingly—against his oppressors, Aspar and Ardabur. The patriarch surrounded by clergy, and Marcellus by monks (with an angel on his left), took their stand in the middle of the hippodrome in front of the imperial box and shouted for hours, Κύριε ἐλέησον. They asked that the Caesar be orthodox or give up his title, and that he not marry the daughter of the emperor. Marcellus encouraged the crowd, saying that the emperor would defeat his powerful enemies (Marcellus had earlier prophesied the Ardaburs' assassination). Leo, in rather vague terms (καὶ ἡμεῖς τὰ αὐτὰ ὑμῖν συμβουλευόμεθα), said he was of one accord with their thinking. According to the *Life of Marcellus*, shortly thereafter Ardabur, Aspar, and Patricius met their end: the lion (Leo) swallowed the snake.<sup>198</sup>

The author of the *Life of Marcellus*, a monk of the monastery of the Akoimetoι, was writing toward the middle of the sixth century,<sup>199</sup> at a point not too far removed from the events he describes. Popular demonstrations in the hippodrome were a feature of the age, and it has been suggested that formulaic chants indicate considerable organization.<sup>200</sup> That emperor, patriarch, and monastics act in concert on a "religious" issue was not the norm.<sup>201</sup> One suspects choreography. Leo had long been working to rid himself of the Ardaburs: Zeno, though avoiding Constantinople, was still active as *magister militum per Orientem*, and is said to have helped in the assassination plot from Chalcedon where he had stationed his Isaurian troops;<sup>202</sup> Heraclius (*comes rei militaris*?) was recalled from Libya and was on hand in 471 in anticipation of the Gothic revolt after the Ardaburs' murder.<sup>203</sup> We have no evidence for Gennadius' relations with the Alans, but the *Life of*

<sup>197</sup>The *Akoimetoι* inhabited one of the most important monasteries in Constantinople; Marcellus was *hegemon* ca. 448–484. See J. Pargoire, "Acémètes," in *DACL* 1 (Paris, 1924), 315–21; Dagron, "Les moines et la ville," 231–38; and, most recently, J.-M. Baguenard, *Les moines acémètes: Vies des saints Alexandre, Marcel et Jean Calybite* (Maine-et-Loire, 1988), 123–42.

<sup>198</sup>In a dream, Marcellus saw a lion harassed by a serpent eventually gulp it down and predicted the downfall of Ardabur and his father (*Vita Marcelli*, chap. 33; ed. Dagron, "La Vie Ancienne," 314). On the lion prophecy, cf. Demandt, "Der Kelch," 111, and Scharf, "Der Kelch," 215–16.

<sup>199</sup>Dagron, "La Vie Ancienne," 276–79; he bases his dating in part on the curious fact that the *Life* does not mention Marcellus' contest with the Monophysite Eutyches between 448 and 451, and suggests this reflects the climate of the period after the monks' papal condemnation for Nestorianism in 534 through the attempts of Justinian and his immediate successors to reconcile the Monophysites. Baguenard, *Les moines acémètes*, 124–25, repeats Dagron's arguments. See also Dagron, "Les moines et la ville," 237, and Pargoire, "Acémètes," 319.

<sup>200</sup>In general, on popular demonstrations in this period, see Av. Cameron, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity, A.D. 395–600* (London, 1993), 171–74. See Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 104 (formulaic slogans), 116 (organized demonstrations), 130 (another instance of *kyrie eleison*).

<sup>201</sup>E.g., Leo had to force Gennadius to ordain Daniel Stylites, *Vita Danielis* 42; ed. Delehay, "Les Saints stylites," 38–39. Gregory, *Vox Populi*, 109 (supporting Dagron's thesis that usually in Constantinople monks and clergy clashed), 112; Dagron, "Les moines et la ville," 274 n. 222, aware that the hippodrome scene contradicts his thesis, lays emphasis on the fact that, though acting in concert, the patriarch and the archimandrite had their own "troops."

<sup>202</sup>Demandt, "Magister Militum," 773; Heather, *Goths and Romans*, 274.

<sup>203</sup>*PLRE*, II, 541–42 (Heraclius 4); Blockley, *Fragmentary Classicizing Historians*, 171; cf. W. E. Kaegi Jr., *Byzantium and the Decline of Rome* (Princeton, N.J., 1968), 40, and F. M. Clover, "Leo I's War of A.D. 470 against the Vandals," *BSCA* 2 (1976), 2–3, who argues that the disaster of the 468 campaign was exaggerated in the sources, while the campaign of 470 achieved some success but had to be recalled before the showdown with Aspar.



*Marcellus* tells of a confrontation between Ardabur and the Akoimetoι (chap. 32: ed. Dagron, 314–16). A certain John who had offended Ardabur took refuge at the monastery (the emperor was powerless against the Ardaburs). The valiant Marcellus refused to hand over John, and eventually a miraculous apparition—a crown of fire with a cross in the center—frightened Ardabur’s soldiers, and he gave up the siege. This dramatic story hints at the hostility between the Ardaburs and the Akoimetoι, and Gennadius, we know, showed favor to the monks, allowing some of them to take up residence in Constantinople at the newly founded Stoudios monastery.<sup>204</sup> Whatever the ecclesiastics’ precise motivation, they were clearly ready to lend their combined weight in swaying popular opinion against the Alans.<sup>205</sup>

Without question, the family of Aspar was debarred from the purple because of its Arian faith.<sup>206</sup> And again, without question, Aspar recognized this. Rather than aspiring to the throne himself, he preferred to maintain his military power;<sup>207</sup> remaining Arian was an important link with his power base, the Germanic peoples. For Patricius there were no such concerns. Clearly, the status of Caesar and son-in-law of the emperor—if it were to be taken at all seriously—required conversion to “Chalcedonian” orthodoxy. There was contemporary precedent for Arians converting in order to win imperial favor and promotion, for example, Jordanes, Ardabur’s immediate successor as *magister militum per Orientem*.<sup>208</sup> Modern scholars treat Patricius’ conversion as fact,<sup>209</sup> though, as Demandt points out, there is no evidence for this in the sources.<sup>210</sup> But there is a hint, however distorted, in Cedrenus that Patricius was at least contemplating this necessary step. According to the twelfth-century historian (PG 121:668A), in 469 when Patricius was made Caesar he was sent to Alexandria because he led Aspar away from the Arian sect and made him pleasing to the emperor. I need not dwell on the improbability of this highly curious trip to Alexandria; what is important is the “confirmation” of what otherwise must be inferred: Patricius’ renunciation of Arianism and the fact that such a conversion was *not* pleasing to Leo.

Whether or not Patricius’ decision to convert was the result of the hippodrome scene or not is impossible to say. The *Vita Marcelli*, as noted earlier, is very vague about any result other than the Ardaburs’ assassination. Most likely, the hippodrome scene represents Leo’s efforts to play a final card, the Alans’ Arianism.<sup>211</sup> Not to be outdone fits well

<sup>204</sup>Theod. Anagn. *HE* 17: PG 86:173B; Bury, *LRE*, I, 386, and Pargoire, “Acémètes,” 316–18, 320–21, emphasize that this did not make the Studites *Akoimetoι*. The latter were monks of a monastery, not an order.

<sup>205</sup>The *Akoimetoι* had a long history of rioting: (A.D. 426 over Nestorius) *Life of Daniel*, trans. Dawes and Baynes, 75 n.; Cameron, *The Mediterranean World*, 64; (518 over the *Henoticon*) Beck, “The Early Byzantine Church,” 435; Pargoire, “Acémètes,” 319; (533–534 over the Theopaschite doctrine) Bury, *LRE*, I, 376; Stallman-Pacitti, *Cyril*, 64 n. 50, 86–88 (related riot in 512 over the wording of the *Trisagion*). The *Akoimetoι* were Antiochene Chalcedonians.

<sup>206</sup>Demandt, “Magister Militum,” 770, argues against their race as a barrier; cf. Dagron, *Naissance*, 208.

<sup>207</sup>Demandt, “Magister Militum,” 770–71.

<sup>208</sup>*PLRE*, II, 620–21 (Fl. Jordanes 3).

<sup>209</sup>E.g., Dagron, “Les moines et la ville,” 237 n. 49; *PLRE*, II, 842.

<sup>210</sup>Demandt, “Magister Militum,” 772.

<sup>211</sup>Malalas, *Chronikon* 14: PG 97:553B (cf. *Chron. Pasch.*, PG 92:828A) says that Leo forbade churches and gatherings to the Exakionite Arians after the execution of Aspar and Ardabur. (I am grateful to Frank M. Clover for this reference and other advice and assistance.) “Exakionite” appears to be a term of derision for Eudoxian Arians, in this period primarily Goths. Cf. Lampe, 491 (Ἐξακιονίτης) and 501 (ἔξουκόντιος), and see Theodoret, *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium* 4.3: PG 83:421B; *Chron. Pasch.*, PG 92:845A.

with everything else we know about Aspar, and the donation to the Anastasia in the general context of vying for popular favor and the specific context of Patricius' imminent conversion may find a plausible historical explanation. The pageantry of the *depositio* (made even more poignant if the Ardaburs did supply the relics), the *oikonomos* Marcian's gratitude for the ecclesiastical vessels, the Gothic language in a famous shrine to Nicaea,<sup>212</sup> all this must have provided Leo with yet another compelling reason to play his final card—murder.

Pacific Lutheran University

<sup>212</sup>The Anastasia seems to have had a dwindling congregation (see above, note 157). Marcian, having made the churches fiscally independent, may well have expected an increase in revenue with the Anastasia welcoming its Gothic neighbors.